THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, M.A., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. III NOVEMBER, 1921 No. 17

THE CATHOLIC AUTHORITY *

You will not, I am sure, think that I am voicing any conventional modesty when I say that I quail before the task which you have assigned to me in this initial lecture of your course. You have assigned it to me presumably because you believe that I shall speak of it *con amore;* and, while that is true, it affords at the same time the measure of my misgiving. For I know that what I love is so far beyond my powers of apprehension, still more of exposition or vindication, that to essay the task at all seems to involve the risk of infidelity. If I set my hand to it, it is in the spirit of St. Augustine's prayer: "Domine Deus, quaecumque dixi de tuo, agnoscant et tui; si qua de meo, et tu ignosce et tui."

A survey of your programme seems to suggest not only that you are interested in Christian Reunion, but that you believe its basis to lie peculiarly in the sphere of Catholic ideals. The universality which the word "Catholic" denotes, and the stress which Catholic Christianity has always laid upon the Unity of the Church, afford an adequate ground for that belief. It would have been possible to have placed this subject last on your agenda, and to have asked someone, who had heard or read all the papers, to gather up into one synthetic statement the positive contributions which each made to the achievement of future Unity. Perhaps you will yet decide to do this. But meanwhile what I think you desire is rather an analytical treatment of Catholicism; such a survey of that vast treasure-house of man's spiritual life as may indicate vital principles of abiding force which are already functioning, under whatever disguises, wherever Christ is named.

And this is a treatment which is at once more possible and more needed to-day than at any time within living memory. It is more possible, because the war and its harvest of problems have made it natural to us to think internationally. Not only has comradeship in arms given us a new respect for the Latin races, but we are learning more and more that the

* A paper read at Blackheath on October 3, 1921. A few verbal alterations have been made.

restoration of prosperity in trade and finance and the possibilities of extending culture depend upon the co-operation of men of different blood, temper, and traditions. This fining down of the edges of our insularity is inevitably reacting upon religion and religious thought. We cannot be blind to the fact, for example, that the centres of stability and reconstructive work in Italy and Germany are at the moment the political parties in those countries which have a definitely Catholic allegiance. We cannot ignore the magnificent moral work and witness of the Church in many parts of France. Nor can we forget that Protestantism in Germany seems to have shared the downfall of the Hohenzollerns. The impact of these facts in purging our minds of prejudice has been immense. We might describe it perhaps by saying that whereas before the war most people thought of the folk in France and Italy as Roman Catholics, now they think of them as fellow-Christians; and that is no less than a spiritual revolution. No doubt they are under a form of jurisdiction which we cannot accept; but that is no more than the Independent believes about me as a member of an Established Church, or I believe about him as belonging to an autonomous congregation. Yet we agree in recognizing the fruits of the Spirit beneath the suspect jurisdictions; and this recognition has now, I believe, by popular voice been extended to the Catholics of the Roman obedience.

Again, the analytical treatment of Catholicism is not only made more possible by the solution of prejudices; it is also imperatively called for by the needs of Christian apologetic. A generation ago it was said in certain circles that science could abandon its wordy warfare with religion, because in time it would prove to have explained religion away. To-day there emerge movements of thought which look as though they had come to redeem that claim. The application of the principles of the New Psychology to Comparative Religion, backed as it may be by the thoroughgoing Immanentism of Gentile and Croce, seems to exhibit religion as simply an activity of the human spirit, unrelated to any transcendent reality, and of no consequence for truth; while at the same time the way is open for the return of a pagan anarchy in morals. This is a form of attack to which all the known types of Christianity are equally vulnerable; and no attempt to save Protestant types by jettisoning Catholic types could have any hope of success. When all is said and done, their respective attitudes towards Prayer and Grace, towards the Bible, and towards the moral law, are too alike to permit of any such distinction lasting long. They stand or fall together. And that being so, Catholicism is likely to prove the mainstay of the defence. For it represents, of

the two, far the larger and more varied accumulation of spiritual experience, far the closer and more continuous integration of that experience with thought, whether critical or metaphysical, and also a power of assimilating and transfiguring the natural and the sensuous which shows that it is no mere "enclave" in the mental activity of mankind.

One of the most arresting features of Catholicism is the importance it attaches to a scale of values which cuts right across that adumbrated by Aristotle when he defined man as "a political animal." As Baron von Hügel puts it, "What concerns us here is not the Supernatural in its contrast and conflict with sin and sinful human nature; but the Supernatural as distinct from healthy nature, and the inter-aid and yet tension at work between them."* The civic or political virtues —family loyalty, honesty, public spirit, sexual morality—are anterior to the Christian ethic, and have survived and could survive without it, though no doubt the Christian faith gives to them a new sanction and a new end.† But in Catholic Christianity a quite peculiar emphasis is laid, and successfully laid, upon qualities and ends which are unknown to, or even repudiated by, those whose scale of values is determined by considerations of natural citizenship only. I say "in Catholic Christianity," and for this reason. It is not that they have not been stressed, and successfully stressed, in Protestantism: the days when Nonconformists were persecuted are full of evidence to the contrary. But, since those days ended, Protestantism has not shown, as Catholicism has, a marked and universal tendency to subordinate its system and methods to the protection and the production of the peculiar values of the Supernatural Life. On the other hand, it is precisely this which accounts for the Catholic doctrine of the Saints, for its practice of canonization, and for the persistent encouragement of the Religious Life. Catholicism, in fact, has shown its sense of the centrality of its scale of values by a method which we more and more recognize to-day as an indication of sincerity: it has specialized on them. It is possible that Evangelical Christianity, which has only been free to develop during the last few generations, will make similar provision as time passes. It is arguable, and on good grounds, that their readiness to suffer persecution in times past was an irrefragable proof of the store they set upon the Christian values. Martyrdom is in itself a form, and a very impressive form, of spiritual and moral specialization. It is significant that the Religious Life, as we

* *Constructive Quarterly*, December, 1920, pp. 641, 642.

† De Quincey's essay on "Christianity as an Organ of Political Movement" is instructive in this connection.

know it to-day—that is to say, the conventual method—did not arrive until the early Church had established its claim to live as against persecuting paganism, a fact suggesting that it provides for instincts which were satisfied by martyrdom in other times. Be that as it may, Catholicism, by its encouragement of the Religious Life, does bear a witness not borne in comparable degree to-day by Protestantism to the specific Christian values; and however justly we may detect abuses and errors in the methods employed to encourage it, the evidence as to the primacy of certain ends and values is not thereby materially impaired.

And what are these values? I am tempted to acquit myself of an attempt to answer by referring again to Baron von Hügel's article quoted above, where he illustrates them with poignant vividness under the seven heads of Courage, Purity, Magnanimous Compassion, Humility, Truthfulness, Self-abandonment to God, and Spiritual Joy. Certainly I cannot improve on what he has said. But perhaps one or two points may be underlined. Humility, for instance, is the root of a group of qualities—meekness, gentleness, long-suffering, patience, self-effacement, and the preferring of others to ourselves—which are not only fundamental to Christian ethics, but are also peculiarly difficult, or even repugnant, to the natural man. Aristotle, for example, does not hesitate to regard a low estimate of oneself as evidence of little-mindedness. The high-minded man, he says, when he receives high honour from good men, will feel pleasure, though in a moderate degree, for he knows that he is obtaining his due, or rather, less than his due, but still the best it is in their power to give, and as such he is willing to accept it.* The temper is common enough, but perhaps an example may not be amiss. It is in an Irish writer's description of Larne in Ulster, and it shall tell its own tale:

"And I saw a monument standing at the water-gate of Larne, the entrance to the harbour, built in the form of an Irish round tower, beside which the mail-packets pass on their way to and from Scotland; and I discovered that this monument was not a religious monument, that there was no mystery connected with it, that it was not erected to a cardinal, or a politician, or an orator, or a disturber of the peace, but that it was a monument put up by Mr. Chaine of Larne, at his own expense, to perpetuate his own memory in his native town, to the advancement of which he had devoted his time, his labours, and his money generously. And I was shown on the hillside overlooking this monument the place where the remains of Mr. Chaine lie, gazing down in spirit upon the harbour of Larne, which was the crowning glory of his life. And then I

* *Eth. Nicom.* IV. iii.

looked up at the top of the hill where his son lives, honoured by his townsmen, both for his own and for his father's sake, and I said to myself, *That is practical patriotism; the spirit of Mr. Chaine explains why Larne is prosperous.* It explains why Antrim is so superior to the Catholic counties in other parts of Ireland."*

It is on precisely such a spirit as this that our Lord makes comment, when He says: "I know you, that ye have not the love of God in you. I am come in my Father's name, and ye receive me not: if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive. How can ye believe, which receive honour one of another, and seek not the honour that cometh from God only?"†

"God only." The "onliness" of God is the correlative of humility towards men; and it is as marked a feature of the Catholic ideal. The Old Testament had spoken of the Divine "jealousy"; there must be no coquetting with other gods. The "onliness" of God is a development from this and entails far more exacting demands. "Seek not ye what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink, neither be ye of doubtful mind. For all these things do the nations of the world seek after; and your Father knoweth that ye have need of these things. But rather seek ye the Kingdom of God; and all these things shall be added unto you" (Luke xii. 29-31). "If any man cometh unto me, and hateth not his own father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple" (Luke xiv. 26). And so St. Paul too: "Yea verily, and I count all things to be loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for whom I suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may gain Christ" (Phil. iii. 8). Face these passages and others like them in all their naked crudity, and you must admit that they represent a scale of values which is not of earthy mould. They may be impracticable for most of us, except by compromise; but at least the Religious Life, which exists to take them literally, guarantees as nothing else does that their original force shall not be obscured or lost.

Now this scale of values and the qualities in which it is embodied, I have spoken of as "supernatural." It is the word which Baron von Hügel uses, and of recent years it has become almost a watchword in Catholic theology. What does it denote? Partly, no doubt, it denotes precisely that contrast which is felt to exist between the Christian ethic and the ethic of Mr. Chaine of Larne, and any others who set up monuments in their own honour. It is supra-natural because it is supra-

* *Priests and People*, by Michael McCarthy, p. 80. The author asserts that he is a Roman Catholic.

† St. John v. 42–44.

civic. But the word carries a deeper meaning still—namely, that these motives, qualities, tempers, are no mere efflorescence of the human spirit, but are the gifts, fruits, energies of the Spirit of God. They are the authentic footprints of God in action. Without this conviction as to the operation of the Holy Spirit, Catholicism, with its fertile constructive confidence, its widely branching theological development, its use of liturgical forms, its doctrine of sacraments, is simply unintelligible. To say that Sanctity has flourished in spite of the system or environment which has, in fact, nursed it is surely to advance an irrational plea. The place which Catholic Christianity explicitly assigns to the Holy Spirit in such crucial experiences as Consecration and Ordination, testifies to a belief which does at least make sense of the phenomena of Church History and enable us to regard it as a continuous process.

It is important, however, to bear in mind a consideration which very closely affects the problem. That consideration is the hiddenness of the Holy Spirit's working. God acts in Him mainly on and through what we now call the Unconscious. In great moments of corporate or individual exaltation we do, no doubt, feel His power; but more normally we discern Him by His effects or fruits. Faith hoists its sail and catches a breeze, which moves the ship but never fans the cheek. Perhaps we may find here the solution of an age-long misunderstanding. The tendency of Protestantism, or at least of Evangelicalism, has been to look to the sudden, the catastrophic, and the abnormal for the manifestation of the Spirit, and to think that where this is absent the Spirit is absent: and the strange happenings at Pentecost and Corinth in the first age of the Church are adduced to justify the view. Catholicism is fully at home with these things, but does not count on them. It assumes, indeed, that the changed conception of the Holy Spirit which we notice on turning from St. Paul or St. Luke to St. John, answers to another, but no less real, dispensation of Providence, and believes that the true *locus classicus* of the theology of the Spirit is to be found there. At the same time Catholic thought may well bear the larger part of the responsibility for the misunderstanding. It is often said, and by scholars of wide esteem, that the Chalcedonian definition marks the bankruptcy of patristic thought. There is much in the criticism. But the reason commonly given for it I believe to be mistaken. The reason commonly given is that it wound the Person of Christ in the cerements of sterile and obsolete formulæ. I believe the true reason to be far more that it did not provide for, or lead to, any development in the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Perhaps, indeed, the time for it was not yet. Perhaps it is only to-day, when the psychology and philosophy of spirit

are coming into their own, that fresh knowledge in this field is to be won. Of this, at any rate, I am convinced, that, whether we seek a strong apologetic against unbelief or a real measure of Reunion among Christians, it is in connection with the Holy Spirit that we shall find it. Catholic and Protestant have common ground there to start from; and they share alike in the opportunities of formulation which the latest developments of modern thought provide.

We may survey this belief in the Holy Spirit in three regions, in particular, of Catholic thought and practice.

1. There is, first, the tradition of the Scriptures. It might seem superfluous to dwell on a feature in Catholic tradition which is so widely accepted outside as well as within that tradition. I do not think so: for, in fact, what is meant by acceptation? It is of the essence of all Catholic and all Evangelical religion that it is thoroughly and happily at home with the Bible. The ground of this is the belief that it is in a unique degree inspired of God. No doubt a higher degree of authority attaches to the New Testament than to the Old, because in the case of the New Testament the canon was not taken over virtually as a whole from past generations, but was built up by the selective activity of the Church, book by book, during the early centuries. The inspiration of the New Testament, that is to say, has vindicated itself in face of a far more searching criticism than that of the Old. But, as the Marcionite controversy showed, the Church appeals to, and carries with it, the Scriptures entire. It is prepared to revise, as it has constantly revised in the past, its modes of interpretation—to find allegory where before it found history, development where before there seemed finality, symbolism where once the letter had seemed to suffice. But what it is not prepared to do is to understand special passages of Scripture in such a way as to make whole books of the Bible mischievous and misleading. That, I believe, is the issue with which Modernism is confronting the Church to-day.

The claim is often made that the same liberty of criticism should be conceded in the New Testament as has for long been granted in the Old. I accept the claim, but on terms, and terms which are applicable to both. The first relates to the necessary limitations of the comparative method. That method is the foundation of biblical criticism, as any reader of Robertson Smith or any student of the Synoptic Problem knows well. But *ex hypothesi* it cannot deal with incomparables. It can compare the external progress of the Jewish monarchy with similar periods in the history of other peoples; but it cannot, on the strength of that comparison, say anything about the call of Samuel, the penitence of David, or the spiritual experience

of Amos or Isaiah. It can point to the affinities between the early narratives of Genesis and the Babylonian mythology; but it cannot say anything, on the strength of those affinities, about the origin and meaning of sin. It can illustrate the records of our Lord's Birth of a Virgin and of His Resurrection from similar elements in the lore of other cults; but it can say nothing about the possibility or the significance of our Lord's Incarnate or Risen Life. Granted these limitations, I should be prepared to concede to criticism the completest liberty on matters purely historical. I can well conceive an impartial historian, for instance, deciding from a purely scientific standpoint that the documentary evidence for the Virgin Birth was too slender to substantiate it. Such a conclusion, formed on a survey of the restricted data which alone are available to the historian as such, need not be, to my mind, inconsistent with a fully orthodox faith. For faith brings into purview a new element which only itself can discern—namely, the congruity* of the fact alleged with the religious experiences and values to which it has been indissociably attached. So far as the autonomy of historical inquiry is concerned, I would readily grant what Modernists claim—the same liberty of criticism in regard to the New Testament as has been exercised for over a generation in regard to the Old. But I should claim that the limits of that inquiry should be recognized.

Secondly, the Church can have nothing to do with what I may call "the theory of the stupid editor." This theory is prominent in Dr. Charles's edition of *Revelation;* it appears in several works (such as Mr. Strachan's) on the Fourth Gospel, and it underlies much that was said at the Modern Churchmen's Conference last August. Its purpose is to explain how a supposed simple, straightforward, undifferentiated narrative or doctrine was developed into one which presents more difficult problems to the modern mind, and the theory does this by assuming that the document in question was revised or edited by someone whose intelligence was unequal to the task. Now literary criticism and the discovery of sources is one thing; abuse of the writers of the New Testament is another; and the Church will have none of it.† There is no reason why proto-, deutero-, and trito-, attached to the name of a New Testament author, should be held to correspond to a descending sequence

* The point is admirably worked out by Canon Quick in the *Church Quarterly* for April, 1921. Lord Acton tells a story of Ranke, which illustrates the mental detachment of the pure historian. "When a strenuous divine, who, like him, had written on the Reformation, hailed him as a comrade, Ranke repelled his advances. 'You,' he said, 'are in the first place a Christian: I am in the first place a historian. There is a gulf between us.'"—*The Study of History*, p. 41.

† A passage in Hazlitt's *Winterslow* is in point here. See his comment on Ayrton's criticism of Chaucer in the second Essay.

in the quality of intelligence. Inspiration apart, and from a common-sense point of view, lapse of years is no disadvantage to the telling of a true story: it gives time for inquiry and criticism as to fact, and for the fuller apprehension of teaching, and that consideration should always be weighed in the balance against the tendency of the human mind to make legend. This is the rock on which, it seems to me, Dr. Rashdall and Dr. Bethune-Baker founder when they reject the Johannine testimony to the pre-Incarnate consciousness of Christ. This teaching might be later than the Lord Himself, and yet not for that reason untrue. It is hard to see in what sense it is consistent to say that the Bible is inspired, and yet to add that in some of its most fundamental affirmations as to the Person of Christ it teaches what is false. According to the old idea of Scripture, Inspiration guaranteed its veracity for all purposes; it was an omniscient oracle. During the last century we have learnt as a result of criticism to think of its various parts or writers as rather inspired *ad hoc*—that is to say, for particular and specific purposes germane to the spiritual life. Those purposes are variously discerned at different times as study and meditation reveal or preaching expounds them. But in every case the Church affirms that the lessons which Scripture intends to teach us are in substance true, whether or not they are contained in the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus. To hold doctrines incompatible with these lessons is in practice to "make the Word of God of none effect."

And, thirdly, I would lay stress upon the inadmissibility, from a Scriptural point of view, of a phrase often used by Modernists — "supernatural, but non-miraculous." That phrase involves a dichotomy between spirit and body, between inward and outward, which is out of tune with the mind of the Bible. The Resurrection provides perhaps the clearest illustration. The Modern Churchmen at Girton seem to observe a curious reticence on this subject; but the question was raised in a crucial form by Canon Streeter's celebrated essay in *Foundations*.* He there accepts the empty Tomb, and he accepts the reality of the appearances of the Risen Lord; but he does not think that the two groups of facts have any intrinsic connection. He believes, in short, that the Lord's Body "saw corruption." Now that is an issue on which I think it would be perfectly reasonable to hazard the whole Christian faith. If he is right, then the miracle which of all others accounts for the faith and joy of the Church of the New Testa-

* It is fair to say that the essay was published in 1912, and it is possible that Canon Streeter has since then altered his view. I should like to take this opportunity of drawing attention to his valuable article in the current *Hibbert* on the composition of St. Luke's Gospel. All students of Christian origins will be grateful to him for it.

ment was a ghost story. The obvious care taken by the Evangelists to rule out precisely this conception counts for nothing. And the ground on which this view is advanced is that the alternatives involve an element of "materialism." Exactly: but that is an element fundamental to Biblical thought, more especially as it concerns the Incarnate Son of God. It is not modern materialism; but the word is fully applicable to it. For the glory of Scripture is not merely that it is a revelation of God, but that it is a revelation in and through history, graven in flesh and blood, Spirit always mated with Body. This is supremely so, of course, in Christ, the Word made flesh; but it runs on, too, into St. Paul's conception of the Church and St. John's doctrine of the Eucharist. If it is materialistic to believe that in the Tomb the Body of Jesus suffered such a change and sublimation of cells and tissues as could enable it to enter the mode of being which is revealed in the Resurrection narratives, then the Church is materialist; but let it be recognized that it is the materialism of St. Luke, St. Paul, and St. John.*

2. Next, it is an axiom of Catholic theology that the outward, sacramental, institutional life on which it lays so much stress functions wholly in and because of the ever-present activity of the Spirit of God. "The flesh profiteth nothing; it is the Spirit that quickeneth. The words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit, and they are life" (St. John vi. 63). It is the conviction of the Church that in Baptism and Absolution, in the Laying-on of Hands, in Anointing, in the Consecration of the Eucharist, God Himself is in action by His Spirit and Word, cleansing, speaking, sealing, strengthening, healing, re-creating. We speak in our Church Catechism of two sacraments only as being "generally necessary to salvation"; because to them only attaches the universal obligation of Christ's express command. The form of the definition has value; but the restriction of the number of the sacraments to two, or even to seven, is a comparative innovation. For the Fathers of the early centuries the word "sacrament" or "mystery" has a wider and freer connotation. Thus Cyprian speaks of the content of the Lord's Prayer as "sacraments";† Tertullian of the sacrament of Christ's Passion being represented in preaching;‡ Ambrose of the Incarnation;§ Augustine of the salt given to catechumens|| as sacraments. As Harnack says, "Everything in any way connected with the Deity and His revelation, and therefore, for example, the content of revelation as doctrine,

* I remember hearing a striking speech by the most eminent of living physicists at a Roman Catholic dinner in Cambridge some years ago, in which from the point of view of a physicist he paid a high tribute to the way in which Catholicism had witnessed to the dignity of "matter."

† *De Orat. Dom.* 9.

‡ *Adv. Jud.* 10.

§ *De Incarn.* 5.

|| *De Peccat. mer. et remiss.* II. xxvi. (42).

is designated 'sacrament'; and the word is also applied to the symbolical, which is always something mysterious and holy."* A sacrament was, in fact, a supernatural act having reference to the Church. And this early undifferentiated conception contains a very vital truth. It is the truth that what the Church does or teaches, Christ does or teaches. He, by His Word or Spirit, is the true agent, and it is His creative energy which is operative in what is done: in every rite, at every altar He is "showing forth His glory"; and for that reason they are charged with a heavenly potency.

Catholic sacramental theology is simply the rationalization and reduction to order of this vast field of sacramental experience. Manifestly the disuse or neglect of this experience is a spiritual loss. The psychology of religion is teaching us that "by rites emotions are re-enacted,"† and the discovery of such a law is obviously of great consequence for faith. To the Catholic the Eucharist is at once a Passion and a Pentecost; it is, indeed, their perfect fusion, the projection into history of them both. And so, too, St. Paul can write that "we are buried with Him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life" (Rom. vi. 4).

Why is it, then, that this highly spiritual conception, which counts so much upon the Divine agency, should have been so misunderstood? Leaving aside reasons of history and political memory, I would point to one cause in Catholic theology itself, which I believe to have contributed no little towards it—namely, the use of the phrase "the sacramental system." In its proper significance, as denoting a coherence of some kind in thought or action, the phrase is unexceptionable. But words are apt to lose their proper meanings, and "system" is one of those which easily does so. It instinctively suggests something mechanical, fixed, and closed. There are, of course, systems to which such terms do not apply—as, for instance, the organic systems of our bodies. But none the less the harmful consequences of the term remain. Harm is done to Catholic thought itself, because the spontaneity and wonder of the Divine action is apt to be obscured; and by natural process harm is done, too, to minds of other mould, which get the impression that, while the Church says *Deus non obligatur sacramentis*, it does not really believe it. I should myself be the first to claim that God's saving grace is normally conditioned by a faithful use of the sacraments; but I should try to emphasize the fact that that is because they are governed and controlled at every point by His free and life-giving Spirit.

* *History of Dogma*, ii. 138 *n.*

† E. O. James in THEOLOGY, September, 1921, p. 180.

A word should be said, perhaps, in this connection about the sacrament of Orders. Orders or Holy Order is, as its name implies, the sacrament of order; and order is a form, and an indispensable form, alike of charity and of truth. Catholic belief postulates for the Church a Ministry whose continuity and interrelation guarantees, even in face (it may be) of evidence to the contrary at any moment, these values; and it can do nothing to abate a principle which history and experience seem so abundantly to vindicate. Schism *is* chaotic; and chaos does give ground to enmity and to error. At the same time I should be far from saying that the Church finds any pleasure in thrusting the problem of the Sacred Ministry into the foreground, though it does so when compelled. The Catholic instinct is far more that which Bacon expresses in his Essay *Of Great Place*. "Preserve the right of thy place, but stir not questions of jurisdiction; and rather assume thy right is silence, and *de facto*, than voice it with claims and challenges." The controversy over Orders which has loomed so large in England for the last generation was, no doubt, a necessary stage in the progress towards Reunion; but it was very far from being the last, or even the penultimate, stage. I venture to think that time must be given for that controversy to subside, and for other issues to emerge—those, in particular, which relate to the Spirit and the Sacraments—before we shall go very much farther along that road.

3. The third aspect of Catholicism which I will ask you to consider is the persistent witness it bears to the validity of human reason, when guided and enlightened by the Holy Spirit. The manifold crop of theological speculation which was harvested in the dogmatic definitions of the Councils, the development of creeds and liturgical forms, the constructive synthesis of scholasticism, the theology of the Anglican divines of the seventeenth century, and in their measure even the post-Tridentine Roman and Eastern formulations, are only explicable on the basis of this belief. This belief in the power of reason to see and to express truth marks, perhaps, the outstanding contrast between Catholic and Puritan thought. The Church regards Holy Scripture, as we have seen, as inspired in a unique and peculiar sense; but it does not believe that inspiration ceased when the latest book of the New Testament was written. It believes, in fact, that it had itself sufficient inspiration to select, over a long period of time, those books which should form part of the Canon; and that the insight which made such a selection possible has never ceased to function. As each successive age has presented its issues and problems, clothed (as is inevitable) in their proper terminology, the Church has reached out to them and sought to declare its own essential faith and message

in and through the conceptions thus available to it. Often there have been long delay and hesitation in accepting the new knowledge—never more than in the years before scholasticism became the recognized theology of the Church. Often there has been a refusal to pursue certain lines of advance—as when the Eastern Church stopped short of the *Filioque*. Always there has been a deep-seated consciousness of the immensity of the interests involved for life and for truth, and a vigilant guardianship of the *depositum fidei*. But none the less advance and development have taken place, and the Church has fed upon the generations it saved.

In this connection I find something to welcome as well as much to criticize in the papers read at the Modern Churchmen's Conference held at Girton last August. Attention has tended to focus itself mainly upon Dr. Rashdall's interpretation of the doctrine of the Incarnation and upon the very destructive article of Professor Bethune-Baker. But there were other voices, and voices which deserve a hearing. When, for example, Dr. Douglas White says that "any creed of value must leave elbow-room for modern thought," and that "if the Church is to retain—or regain—its influence, it must absorb science, not nibble at it; and in absorbing science, it must itself necessarily be altered by that absorption," his contention is one which we need not hesitate to endorse. The notion that the Church of England should propound a new and much reduced creed is, no doubt, ridiculous; but it is gratifying to note how many of the speakers, particularly among the laymen, insist that a creed of some sort is necessary; whether, as Dr. Percy Gardner says, "to voice the historic continuity of the Church and its permanent relation to Christ," or to serve (as the Master of Marlborough sees it) as an "oath of allegiance" for the Christian army, or (in Professor Sorley's words) to witness to "the importance of knowledge" as "a way in which the religious consciousness as a whole finds expression, and which elevates and protects the other factors of the religious life."

But, that being so, in what sense can we look upon the Creeds as final statements of belief? Professor Sorley, whose paper shows a real understanding of the Catholic position, puts the question thus: "First Platonism and then Aristotelianism gave its colour to Church doctrine; and, had a new formulary been produced in England twenty or thirty years ago, it is safe to say that it would have been an amalgam of the ideas of Hegel and Darwin. Fortunately that danger has been averted, and the Christian is not required to believe in Hegel or in Darwin. But should Plato or Aristotle have any greater authority over his belief?" The answer, of course, is No. The case which Professor Sorley cites is a verse from the *Quicumque*

vult, and one could, no doubt, point to similar cases in other ecumenical confessions and definitions. The mistake here lies in failing to distinguish between the form or terminology in which a doctrine is expressed and its essential content. What is authoritative is the latter, not the former. The latter represents original revelation given through history, recorded in Scripture, and ever more fully apprehended in the experience of the Church. But at every point, not excluding the initial stage of the process, the interpretation of this revelation is limited to the conceptions available at the time; and there is always in this interpretation a transitory element, a husk which protects the kernel. Only let us be sure that we preserve the kernel. And that kernel is not, as so many Modernists seem to suppose, something quantitatively less than the kernel and husk combined. The most archaic of patristic formulæ represents a "proportion of faith," a coherency of elements, a *schema* of some kind. A man is perfectly entitled to say that the language which speaks of human nature being assumed in the Incarnation means nothing to him, since he does not know what "human nature" or "assumption" are. But he is not entitled, if he would hold the Catholic faith, to dismiss the ideas thus metaphorically expressed. The schematic value of the definition, protecting as it does the double truth of Christ as both God and Man, and of the pre-existence of the Incarnate, abides unimpaired by any inadequacy in the terms employed. If, from a Catholic standpoint, one objects to such restatements of the Faith as were outlined at Cambridge by Dr. Rashdall and Professor Bethune-Baker, it is because they violate this *schema*, and instead of restating an old doctrine state in fact a new one.

My own inclination is to doubt whether philosophy is to-day sufficiently settled in its use of terms to permit of a really successful attempt to restate the doctrine of Christ's Person. But I should be sorry to suggest that this inability extends to the whole field of Christian doctrine. We shall do well to remember how small a part of the whole Church the Church of England is, and concern ourselves rather with those formularies for which we are, in our present position, responsible than with those which we share with the rest of Catholic Christendom. To construct a new creed for Anglicans is a notion which to me is not only fantastic, but repellent; for it means simply to stereotype our isolation, and therefore, with eyes open, to take a retrogade step. "Quench not the smoking flax" of hope in a realized Catholic unity. The cave of Adullam may be very comfortable for those who are in it, but they are of no use to their neighbours outside; and our task to-day is to play our part in the whole field of the Christian

Church. And that rôle will be begun when we take steps to set what really is our own house in order. I can echo the words of Dr. Douglas White at Cambridge, when he asks us to "look on the question of creed, not in the light of a policy of 'reunion,' but as a matter of urgent domestic reform within the Church of England"; though I should insist that such a reform would, in point of fact, react very rapidly upon reunion. In other words, what I want to see taken in hand is the Thirty-nine Articles. We have there a piece of "urgent domestic reform" which we are equipped to deal with, towards which men of all schools of thought could contribute, and where great things might be achieved. If the damaging rifts in our ecclesiastical life to-day are to be healed, it can only be by a reconsideration of the grounds of belief; and there the Articles shed little or no light. God forbid that we should revise the Articles—still less add to them—and present them afresh: that would be worse than keeping them in the cupboard. After all what both clergy and laity want is not a special test for Anglicans superimposed upon the Scriptures and the Creeds, but a practical manual of teaching; a Greater Catechism, in fact. Such a Catechism could be written in the language of to-day, and could deal with living issues: and its compilation and use should lead the laity to accord a new confidence to the teaching office of the Ministry.

But it is time to conclude. You will probably have recognized that the conception of Inspiration which I have tried to unfold in its application to the Scriptures, to the sacramental and institutional life of the Church, and to the validity of theological thought, provides the essentials of a doctrine of Authority. If it stands, the view of religion expressed in the title of Sabatier's book, *The Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit*, belongs to a past age: the terms contrasted are not opposites, but complementary. The function of our own Communion seems to lie peculiarly in the embodiment of their synthesis. And we need not be afraid that such real insight as we claim for the Church's authoritative voice at any moment will close any avenues to faith or narrow the compass of serious inquiry. Beyond the simplest and least disputed Article of the Creed there stretches the uncharted seas of the Divine Love, calling to the men of all nations to launch out into their deep. Of that quest and its goal, we may say what Plato says of his own philosophy in his Seventh Epistle: "It cannot be put into words as can other inquiries, but after long intercourse with the thing itself and after it has been lived with, suddenly, as when the fire leaps up and the light kindles, it is found in the soul and feeds itself there."

E. G. Selwyn.

THE CAMBRIDGE CONFERENCE PAPERS AND THE DOCTRINE OF THE ENHYPOSTASIA

A PERUSAL of the Cambridge Conference Papers reveals no new or startling factors in the study of the Christological problem. As was anticipated, the writers have brought no new difficulty forward which was not perfectly familiar to students, and no criticism of the received Christology of which we have not been perfectly conscious for many years past. The points raised in these Papers have formed the theme of almost endless dissertations and books in modern times, and the difficulties and objections to the Church's teaching have been answered over and over again so far as they can ever be fully met from the orthodox standpoint.

The only difference between this and previous controversies is that on this occasion the discussion has been overheard by the " man in the street," and the discovery has been made that the general public is in this—as indeed in most religious subjects—keenly, if not wistfully, interested. The belief in a coming religious revival finds some justification from the fact that the public press can devote so much space to subjects of this kind without the fear of finding their readers wearied and reluctant to read what is there written. The only parallel is the campaign of an ancient rationalist, Arius, who with true journalistic instinct managed to create a tremendous sensation in Alexandria concerning the Person of Christ, and made a bid for popular support by a frank appeal to human logic and common sense in refutation of the Church's belief in the true deity of the Son of man. The parallel fails, however, in that the Church leaders and the authorities in those days took action, and the Council of Nicæa in A.D. 325 settled the question for faith, and defined the issues in terms which precluded the possibility of subterfuge, and brought home even to the dullest intelligence the fact that if the line of demarcation had to be drawn between the Creator and the creature, then Jesus of Nazareth must be placed with God on the one side and His Being defined in terms of Consubstantiality, One in Essence with the Father as touching His Godhead. On the other side of the line were all created beings. Affinity, similarity, likeness, and all such terms of compromise were definitely ruled out, and the Incarnation was once for all differentiated from Divine Immanence.

We have no Councils now, but there is no reason why the issues should not be equally clearly defined in these days when New Theology has been for some time past engaged in obscuring them, under the influence of a pantheistic philosophy.

The Catholic doctrine maintains that He Who was God, without ceasing to be what He was, became man—*i.e.*, entered into the conditions of our finite existence in time and space—and dwelt amongst us. The opposite opinion is that he who was a man became what he was not—viz., Divine—or, if you like, that he who was a man exhibited the maximum of Divine immanence in his human life. Now the one conception is at least conceivable; the other suggests that the barrier between the Creator and the creature has been removed in such a manner as to enable that which is human to partake of the Divine essence to the extent of becoming one in nature with God.

If objection be taken to the use of the terms "Creator" and "creature," and we be asked to define the issue in terminology which certainly lends itself to ambiguous juggling, we do so under protest. If we use the phraseology, "Divine" and "human," then we have this issue: Either He Who was Divine became man, or he who was a man in some sense is to be regarded as Divine. Clearly this phraseology demands definition. Is our divinity different in kind from His? If so, in what precisely does the difference consist? If it be a difference in kind, it must be the difference between the Divinity of God in His own right, and the conferred divinity we possess as creatures receiving from Him a supernatural Grace. Again, His Humanity and ours differ. Ours is the creaturely humanity of the created and sinful; His is the Humanity of the Creator.

Now with these distinctions in our minds, we can consider the above two conceptions of the Person of Christ. He Who was essentially Divine with a divinity consubstantial with God's became incarnate by the Holy Ghost, of the Virgin Mary, and was made man. Such an Incarnation is conceivable, if we remember that the way had been paved for it from the first creation of man in the Divine image. This means that there is a human element in God from all eternity, and this human element had been imperfectly reflected in created form in the sons of men. The truly human is the humanity of God; the merely or purely human is the humanity of man—a created and imperfect humanity which can never become anything but human, no matter how fully indwelt it may be by the Divine. When, therefore, God became Man, the Humanity He exhibited was not a created humanity, such as ours is, but the

truly human such as God alone possesses, and in the likeness of which we are made. Now in the light of this, it is clear how inadequate the alternative theory of Christ's Person is. He who was a man, a creature like ourselves (for the Virgin Birth is denied), exhibited in his own person the Divine in human life. But if he were a man already, he could never have become other than merely or purely human, even if in his case the "incarnation" be interpreted as the exhibition of the climax of the Divine immanence. Except upon the supposition (which is fundamentally subversive of Catholic teaching) that man is capable of deification, the human can never become the divine. It may become wonderfully like it; it has affinity with it, but likeness is not identity. The human at its maximum is but the likeness of the truly human which is in God alone. This means ultimately that the humanity of Jesus Christ was not the humanity we know in ourselves. It was God's humanity, which differs from ours to the extent to which the Creator differs from the creature. God's humanity revealed in Christ is the unveiling before our eyes of that of which we are created copies. The original is His. Created copies may, by His fashioning, become wonderfully like unto Him; that is their goal and end. Advance in holiness will make us more truly human, not quasi-divine beings. If an approximation to the truly human reveals us as more and more like God, this likeness is never identification in essence. We may call it, if we like, the divine in human life, but we must not identify our acquired divinity with that of Jesus, and be misled into thinking that our likeness to Him makes Him in all points identical in nature with us.

That we should see points of similarity between the Humanity of the God-Man and our humanity is to be expected, but this must not blind us to the fact of an eternal distinction between Him and us in the midst of innumerable points of contact we love to discover and dwell upon as linking the Jesus of the Gospels with our imperfect human lives. We may grant the Modernist all he asks for when he points us to the complete manhood of our Blessed Saviour, but this complete Manhood, this truly human character, is only conceivable upon the supposition that it was not human as we know the human; it was the truly human as it exists not in us but in God alone, and in us only as a pale copy, a created imitation of the truly real. And surely this difference makes itself felt in a thousand ways as we study this Jesus of the Gospels, as we hear His words and mark His attitude as He moves about amongst men. The "man in the street" instinctively feels this subtle difference, even though he may not be able to define its content.

It suggests to his mind that modern Churchmen in conference, in spite of their obvious sincerity, their appeal to reason and common sense, and their helpful attempt to do justice to the personality of the wonderful figure of the Gospels, have somehow missed their way and fallen short of the true solution in their efforts to describe the indescribable solely in terms of the best we know in human life.

The merely human, even if called the revelation of the Divine in human life, cannot quite contain all that Jesus was, and the " something more " that is demanded by the evidence of the Gospel data is just this difference between the reality and its shadow in the finite human life of the creature; just the difference between the original and the copy—the Humanity of Deity and the humanity of the creature made in the image of God; like Him, indeed, at its best, but not He in the ultimate analysis.

The frank recognition of these differences between His Divinity and ours, His humanity and that we know in ourselves, is necessary, if we are to make any attempt to-day to face afresh the Christological problem. Let us state quite simply, at the risk of repetition, precisely in what these differences consist:

1. The difference between His Divinity and ours is the difference between Deity in its own right and conferred or derived divinity such as we are capable of possessing, if so be that God dwells in us.

2. The difference between His Humanity and ours is the difference between a Humanity which is truly Human because it is His Humanity, and our imperfect human nature which can approximate to the truly Human to the extent to which He dwells in it. It is thus the difference between the perfect and the imperfect—a difference, if you like, in degree, but a difference which must ever separate us from Him, inasmuch as He possesses completely what we can only come to possess as a gift from Himself when He feeds us with His Sacred Humanity. The human as we know it must ever remain imperfect apart from His gift to it of Divine Grace. The human needs the Divine in order to make it truly human. The Human in Jesus Christ was truly human only because He Who was Divine dwelt in It, and His Presence made the Human Nature He assumed Divinely Human. Thus to sum up the points:

The distinction between Jesus Christ and ourselves is one that concerns both factors, the Human and the Divine. As regards the first, His is the Humanity of Deity, not a created copy such as we possess. Hence the conception of Him as the Archetypal Man. Hence also the wonder of His truly Human life, which could be at once particular and limited, whilst at the

same time Universal and unlimited in its worldwide revelation to all races of what the truly Human really is.

As regards the second, He is Divine in His own right; His Deity is not a conferred divinity such as ours is, and in the possession of which we can alone achieve our true end—viz., to become not quasi-Divine beings, but our truly human selves.

If, further, a theory is required to do justice to both these factors in the Christological problem and to keep us to the true perspective in our efforts to formulate the relationship between the Divine and the Human both in ourselves and in the Person of Christ, then the doctrine of the Enhypostasia, reinterpreted in terms of modern thought, is the only one that can cover the whole data and do justice to the reality of the Human and the Divine, and thus keep us true to the Nicene and the Chalcedonian Christology.

To make the issue plain in a sentence. We challenge the whole Modernist identification of the Divine and Human in us with the Divine and Human in the Person of Christ. There is a difference in both cases, and confusion results if we persist in ignoring this difference. At the same time the differences do not preclude such a measure of affinity and likeness as to make an Incarnation possible. They do rule out identity and so preclude Pantheism.

The conception of the Incarnation as the climax of Divine Immanence in human life falls short of the Catholic teaching in this, that ultimately it comes to the thought of God dwelling in a man, a particular person, Jesus of Nazareth, in whom He dwelt ὡς ἐν οὐδενὶ ἄλλῳ. This gives us two persons—a particular person, Jesus, and God, Who dwelt in him. We thus reach Nestorianism. This is inevitable if we regard the central constituent of the Person of Christ as human. The problem, then, is to say whether any degree of Divine indwelling in a human person can make that person other than human. And, if we argue from our experience of the Divine in human life, the answer must be that it would not. No amount of inpouring into the human can make it other than human. The more fully we are endowed by Divine Grace, the more truly ourselves we become; the more intimately the Holy Spirit of God pervades us through and through, the more truly human we find ourselves becoming. St. Paul's experience of a life hid with Christ in God did not make him other than human. He was never more truly himself than when he had surrendered himself wholeheartedly to the Divine embrace. And with this deep truth is bound up the whole question of our future destiny as the sons of God. In it we have the guarantee, as against all forms of Eastern Pantheism, that God will preserve and respect our

individuality and save us from such an absorption into Himself as shall involve the loss of our own created and distinctive personality. The maximum, then, of the Divine Immanence in human life leaves that human life truly human, not Divine. The human remains itself and is not transmuted into the quasi-divine. We may speak of the man as human with the Divine in him, but we cannot call him a Divine Person in the sense in which the Church regards Jesus Christ as such.

We must then postulate that in His case the central constituent of His Person was Divine. A pre-existent Divine Person, One with God in Essence, at a certain point in the world's history was born into the conditions of our finite life. The problem, then, is to conceive of the possibility of such an event, and to define so far as possible what are the conditions under which such an event could have taken place. How could God live a human life? How could that which is immortal and infinite be at the same time mortal and finite? How, again, can we speak of His having been a real human person when the human ego in His case was *ex hypothesi* not there. Does not this inevitably suggest an Impersonal Manhood? Have we not drifted into Apollinarianism? Are we not thinking of a Divine Person clothing Himself with the attributes of humanity—taking a human body and dwelling in it? The contention of the Modernists is that this is precisely what is implied in the Christology of the Chalcedonian Fathers, and that it is fundamentally subversive of the reality and completeness of the Manhood of Jesus Christ as that is revealed to us in all its truly human naturalness in the Gospel portrait.

Now in the first place the Chalcedonian formula was not meant as an explanation of the mystery, but as a clear statement of the problem involved with a warning that in the attempt to solve it we must be careful above all else not to neglect or overlook any of the data. If we do so, the formula tells us we shall inevitably fall into certain clearly defined errors, such as Apollinarianism, Arianism, Eutychianism or Nestorianism. We may fail to do justice to the reality and completeness of Christ's Manhood. We may fail to realize the truth of His Essential Consubstantiality with God. We may think of His Person as in some sense an amalgam of the Divine and the Human personalities, thus confounding the Persons. We may be led to think that there were really two Persons: a man, Jesus by name, and God Who dwelt in him as in no other. All these solutions had been put forward by thinkers in the endeavour to solve the Christological problem, and the Chalcedonian Fathers warn us that these solutions failed because of some one-sided exaggeration of one or other factor in the data. We are told what to avoid. We

are instructed what to bear in mind as essential to a right faith. We are not bound, however, by any theory. Certain erroneous theories are ruled out, it is true; but the Church does not bind us to any positive theory in so many words. We are still free within these limits to construct a theory for ourselves if we can. Now the significance of the Modernist movement lies in the fact that they are attempting to construct a theory in the light of what they consider to be the better opportunities opened before us to-day as the result of the advance in knowledge since the days of Chalcedon. The Cambridge Conference Papers are an insight into the kind of advance that we are supposed to have made in the direction of restatement. Naturally we examine them from the point of view of a critical inquiry as to whether they have managed in their restatement to avoid the pitfalls against which the ancient writers warned us. The result of such an examination is not very reassuring. In many particulars, as it seems to us, these writers appear to have fallen into precisely the mistakes against which they were warned by the Chalcedonian Fathers.

Some of these writers, whilst believing that orthodox Christology is fatally infected with Apollinarianism, themselves show all the symptoms of the disease known as Nestorianism. It will clear the issues in dispute if we just recall to mind what is involved in the Nestorian circle of thought.

Nestorian thought revolves around the conception of a distinct human person, Jesus of Nazareth, possessing all the inviolable rights and sanctities of our human personality in relation to God Who made us; possessing, *i.e.*, that measure of freedom and separation from Himself which He has granted to the sons of men, and which we have learned that He will respect and not violate under any circumstances. The next step in the Nestorian thought is to conceive of this person, Jesus, as so wonderfully free from self-assertion and self-will in relation to God as to constitute in himself an ideal medium through which God could function and in whom God could dwell.

God enters into our lives to the extent to which we are prepared by a free act of will to allow Him to take possession of us, to enter, a welcome guest, into the inmost sanctuary, and to reign there as Lord. Now Jesus Christ's whole life (so runs the argument) was lived on this principle—"Not my will but Thine be done." Hence God was able to dwell in him to a degree never before achieved in all the age-long endeavours of the Heavenly Father to enter into the lives of the creatures whom He loved and whom He had made for Himself, and through whom He longed to manifest Himself in the world. He had succeeded to a certain extent before in the long line of saints, and now

at last He finds a man pre-eminently fitted and prepared to fulfil the conditions of the Divine indwelling. Hence He becomes incarnate in him. So full of God is he in consequence, so really present is God in his person, that men can dare to offer worship, not indeed to him (this were "Jesus-worship"), but to God in him. Not that the worship is paid to him as such, but all prayer is addressed to God through Jesus Christ (*i.e.*, to the God Who dwells in him).

As Nestorius himself put it: "I worship him who is assumed for the sake of Him Who assumes him; for the sake of Him Who is invisible I worship him who is visible." And again: "He that is assumed shares the name of God with Him Who assumes." Typical Nestorian phraseology is the following: Mary bore "the man who is the instrument of the Godhead"; "the temple which He might inhabit."

Now on this view there is not the slightest difficulty in conceiving of the true manhood of Jesus. We can strain the English language, as the writers of the Cambridge Conference Papers do, in the endeavour to make it plain that Jesus was bone of our bone, flesh of our flesh, a real man, an individual Jew of Palestine, as distinctly and emphatically an individual as any of us, whatever else he may have been in addition to this, and so on. We can say at the same time, if we like, that he was a Divine person. He was, in fact, the example, *par excellence*, of the Divine immanence. The human in his case was the most wonderful revelation of the Divine ever presented to the world, and in him we see to what heights the human can reach when Divinely indwelt. And all the time we are, whilst moving in this circle of thought, poles asunder from the Catholic conception of the Incarnation; we have not come within measurable distance of what the Church really teaches in the Nicene and Chalcedonian Christological formulæ. Nor, again, can we ever hope, whilst we stay within this circle of thought, to reach the true significance of the Deity of Christ as against Arianism and modern Unitarianism.

It comes, then, to this, that no true solution of the Christological problem is adequate if our starting-point is a human Jesus, the central constituent of whose person is a human ego. We must begin with the Alexandrian conception of a Divine Personality, and then face the real crux of orthodox Christology —viz., the charge of Apollinarianism.

Can this charge be met? We think it can to an adequate extent by the doctrine of the Enhypostasia.

Leontius of Byzantium was perfectly aware of the fact that the Chalcedonian formula must be interpreted either in an Antiochene or in an Alexandrian sense. He saw clearly that

this latter sense was the only sound one to secure a real Incarnation. He was well aware of the Apollinarian danger, and he set himself to combat this on the basis of Aristotelianism.

The modern reinterpretation of this doctrine has these points in view:

1. An analysis of human personality reveals it as ever incomplete and in process of becoming. An investigation of religious experience in general and the specifically Christian experience of communion with God in Christ in particular suggests that the incompleteness of human personality is met by, and its growth depends upon, the Divine Grace; the imparting of the Divine Life to the human in communion and fellowship. The result of such Divine Self-donation is an ever-increasing approximation of the merely human to the truly human. The greater the fulness of the Divine Grace, the more truly, not purely, human, a man becomes. The lives of the saints testify to this. The Ideal is seen in the Person of Christ, Who alone can be spoken of as τελειος ἄνθρωπος because He was not merely or purely human—not the possessor, therefore, of an imperfect manhood—but truly human in that He was Divine. His Divinity therefore gave to His Humanity just that element which was needed for its completeness and perfection.

2. God is perfect Personality, and our human personalities are mere approximations to this—pale copies, as Lotze taught us long ago.

3. There is a human element in God, and this alone makes an Incarnation possible, inasmuch as it secures such an affinity between the human and the Divine as is essential to any true union of them both. Affinity, however, is never identity.

4. From this it follows that God already possessed in Himself, prior to the Incarnation, everything needful to enable Him to live a truly human life. In the Incarnation, therefore, the pre-existent Divine Logos brought to the human nature He assumed just that element which we have seen above (under our first point) to be essential, if the merely human is to become truly and completely human. The Divine Logos was capable, therefore, of being the Ego, not only of the Divine, but also of the Human nature. Because His Personality, in virtue of its Divinity, already possessed all that is most distinctive of a truly human personality, it follows that if the Divine Ego were the central constituent in His Person, the Manhood was not impersonal. Why? Because this same Divine Ego possessed all that was needful to impart a truly human personality to that which otherwise would have remained impersonal and merely a series of detached human attributes, lacking a central focus such as our human ego gives to our human nature. His Ego

was Divine—it was also, therefore, in His case human. Had it lacked the human element in God, it could not have had a Manhood other than impersonal, but the whole point of the doctrine of the Enhypostasia is that the greater contains the less—the Divine Ego, because it is God's Personality, must contain the human ego in the image of which we are made.

If man be made in the image of God, there must be something in God to which we bear an imperfect likeness. Now in what precisely in us is this likeness to be found? Not in our bodily shape, surely, but in that which differentiates us from the animal creation, that which we call human personality. In our case, as we have seen, this human personality is incomplete and imperfect, a faint copy of the Original which God alone possesses, and in which He has made us. Therefore, if He chooses to live a human life, He can do so, and reveal in human form what a truly human personality really is. Because He was the Son of God, He was capable of living a human life, not as a merely human person, one of ourselves, would live it, but as it should be lived and as He alone has lived it. He was perfect Man because He was perfect God. He alone could live a truly human life, because at every moment of His earthly career He was also the Divine Son of God.

What was wanted was a revelation of One Who was Divine, and therefore perfectly human, even if infinitely more than this. The human ego in man is incomplete. The Manhood of Christ, if it had possessed a human ego only, would have been incomplete.

Now the Modernists are demanding that we recognize the completeness, the reality, and the perfection of Christ's Manhood. They think that this is secured if the central constituent of His Person is a human ego. According to our view this is precisely the condition of securing that His Manhood would be incomplete. If the central constituent were a human ego only, He would be *ipso facto* imperfect. They think that if His Personality were Divine His manhood would be impersonal. Precisely the opposite would be the case according to the doctrine of the Enhypostasia.

We grant with Leontius that a φύσις ἀνυπόστατος is a mere philosophical abstraction. Manhood as an attribute or series of attributes has no meaning, if meant as a substitute for a truly personal life such as we know Jesus lived in the days of His flesh. We contend, however, that the Manhood of Jesus Christ was not without hypostasis—it was not impersonal even though His personality was a Divine Personality. The human nature became hypostatic in the Person of the Logos. As against Nestorians we deny that the human personality ever had an existence in its own right as a distinct entity before the Incarna-

tion. Jesus Christ, the merely human man, never existed. Although the manhood had no independent personality of its own, and had, in fact, no existence at all before the Incarnation, nevertheless it became hypostatic in the Person of the Logos, and received its subsistence from Him. The human nature of the God-Man was from the first inseparably united with the Divine Nature, and in virtue of that union received from the Logos-Personality its personality, and thus its completeness.

If Divine Personality already contains in Itself all that goes to make up what is distinctively human personality, then the doctrine of Enhypostasia escapes the charge of Apollinarianism whilst doing justice to the truth contained in that error—viz., that there is a human element in God—and this is the basis of the Incarnation.

We are well aware that in thus attempting to state in popular language a theory of this kind we lay ourselves open to misinterpretation, and are exposed to the charge of misuse of phrases. What is here written is no philosophical treatise, but an effort to state in untechnical language, so far as possible, a theory which can in reality be substantiated in the light of the profoundest analysis of personality, human and Divine, of which modern philosophical speculation and psychological investigation is capable.

For a much more exhaustive treatment we may perhaps be allowed to refer to *A Study in Christology* (S.P.C.K., 1917). All we ask is that the Modernists will study the doctrine of the Enhypostasia in all its bearings, and then ask themselves whether it does not do justice to all for which they are contending when they plead for the reality and completeness of Christ's truly human life, and whether the doctrine does not at the same time acquit the received Church Christology of the charge of Apollinarianism whilst enabling us to do full justice to the Deity of Christ in a way in which we venture to think that the modern attempt at reconstruction in the Cambridge Conference Papers on the basis of a human personality of the God-Man fails to do.

H. Maurice Relton.

THREE PERSONAL STUDIES

I.—HENRY SCOTT HOLLAND

Mr. Stephen Paget's *Memoir and Letters* of Dr. Holland—a beautiful and vivid book—and Canon Richmond's specialized attempt in his *Philosophy of Faith* to give the gist of Holland's thought, do not, together, entirely satisfy those who knew him, not only as one of the most beloved and brilliant personalities of his time, but also as one of its greatest and most prophetic teachers.

Circumstances, chiefly of health, but also of many-sided vocation and extraordinarily versatile responsiveness, deprived us of the comprehensive Theodicy which he might have written. Unfortunately it lies scattered (in the main) over volumes of sermons. A rich and stimulating reward awaits some of the younger generation who want to be true to Reason and Faith, and will be at pains to recover and put together its vivid features. But obviously they will be few, and we ask ourselves, with not a little mortification and disappointment, why so glorious a soul and mind should be so imperfectly recognized and understood.

I find one reason in the manner of his utterance, not merely in the disconnectedness already referred to, but in its form and style. There are those who would briefly explain it and discount him by talking of him as a rhetorician. Let them talk, or let them read some typical rhetoric and then come back to Holland's burning thought.

Yet their criticism is not wholly pointless. Holland was rhetorical, and a master of rhetoric as a speaker and writer. By rhetoric he could stir and sway and kindle "vast audiences in the North," great congregations in St. Paul's, and astonished and delighted meetings, missionary and other. Few men wielded so great a power of speech: humour, dialectic, illustrative vivid description, and appeal to the whole gamut of human feeling were all at his command. He left great impressions: he had incomparable range and variety. He was rhetorical, and no doubt the rhetoric had at times its overluxuriance. To some temperaments, fastidious, critical, or prosaic, it was an obstacle and not a magnet.

But as it would be absurd to think of Holland as a rhetorician, so rhetoric is not the really characteristic thing about his manner. Undoubtedly he was hard to be understood of many: he often left behind him even those whom his language and his passion kindled. My own explanation of this is that

his mind was of a rare kind, rare anywhere, specially rare perhaps among English folk. The distinctive quality of it was intellectual imagination. It was akin to the great reflective poets such as Wordsworth, to whom all his soul went out in sympathy. But he differed from the great architects of poetry by the subordination of this poetic faculty to the service of strong, consistent, and massive thinking. He was almost always the philosopher (or theologian) and the poet in one. He showed, indeed, in his Romanes Lecture on Bishop Butler, what strong use he could make of English unadorned. But the other was his more usual manner. He did not merely "throw out ideas" or expound thought. He made them concrete; he gave them imagery; he tried to catch us all up along with him as if the quest was ours and our vision was as quick and mobile and penetrating as his.

But he had himself perfect grip of the truth that he was illuminating: there was no flabbiness in the anatomy of his personages or of his trains of thought. Coherent in themselves, they had a larger coherence with his whole thinking.

The last words carry me on from the manner to the substance of his thought. It is easier, everyone knows, to be clear for a specialist than for one who is synoptic and comprehensive. Holland could, indeed, turn on that wonderful intellectual imagination of his upon particular experiences, or problems, or scenes, and focus it upon them with intense concentration. But much more deeply and essentially characteristic of his thinking was its range.

It belonged alike to his mind and his character to be open to the claims of different kinds of thought and experience, to give them sympathetic and discerning appreciation, to draw them together in harmony and proportion.

Accordingly he was instinctively, and with unwavering and deepening conviction, the philosopher-theologian. For him it could not be otherwise. There was but one field of knowledge, one harmony of truth. At times some of us who knew the unfailing tact and balance of his theological judgment regretted that he could not give himself to maturing his doctrinal teaching (hearers of his lectures on St. John knew what he was capable of on that side).

It was equally true that he might have specialized with penetrating insight and sure touch upon problems of pure philosophy. But we were wrong. His was the nobler gift of natural synthesis. It was no accident that his two lecturing subjects were St. John and Plato.

Nothing could have been more alien to him than a patchwork compromise, as between separate subjects and rival

authorities. To him truth in nature and thought was a whole of sacred meaning, with the Divine Incarnation as its climax and crown and key. He would as little have tampered with the severity of a philosophical problem by putting in a dash of theology, as he would have tried to commend the Gospel by "philosophizing" it. The truth of what I am trying to say is perhaps best shown by his treatment of Reason and Faith (or, again, "Logic and Life.") They had been opposed as enemies, contrasted as opposites, made to pay distant respect to one another, treated as faculties. For Holland they were parts of one energy. Reason could move no step without faith: faith had its passionate loyalty for reason. Nothing was more characteristic or more keen in Holland than his dislike of any attempt to clear the field for faith by disparagement or despair of reason. He flashed out against anything of the kind with all a lover's loyalty, or all a specialist's devotion. And this although he credited reason with an instinct, for which there is no other word than faith, to leap towards truth which is not yet proved, but proves itself. How he would have delighted to hear it said (as it was to me the other day by a student of physics), that the only hope of the higher Physics now was from men of "terrific imagination." Thus it was that it has always seemed to me that two honoured contemporaries who had an instinct of distrust for one another, Balfour and Holland, were, in fact, presenting, one critically and even sceptically, the other confidently and even triumphantly, the same truth that while reason by itself "will not do," because it has, and indeed knows that it has, its own limitation, yet the reasonable self in man has a deep self-trust by which it moves and goes forward and achieves, and which is met by "intimations" and welcome from that which is its Goal, and has been all through a creative and driving power within it.

Without words for which there is no space here, it can be seen how in a generation staggered by discoveries of evolution, and by the contemptuous triumph of inductive over deductive logic, Holland appeared, not to fight a desperate rearguard battle over a narrowing territory, but to welcome a great display of Divine creative impulse, a great interpretation of the slowness of God!

He was ready for Bergson's *élan de vie*. He saw his way (as he showed in *Fibres of Faith*) through all the strange and religiously terrifying things of anthropology. For him God "saw the substance" of humanity "yet being imperfect, and in His book were written" all the slow pages of its racial embryology. What this means can best be realized by anyone who will be

at the pains to read the first fifty short pages of *Fibres of Faith*. Thus it was that it was said by younger men, that as they worked out their difficulties or discovered their convictions, Holland " was always there before them."

And, as I believe, it is for the same reason that his thought does not grow stale, and is as fresh, in its special quality and character, as when it was also novel.

Nothing finer, I am convinced, has been written about Faith and Reason than such a passage on pp. 32-34, *Lux Mundi* (first edition). But in the first three sermons of *Logic and Life* (the volume of which Holland used later to say " all that I have ever said was there ") his message will be found in its first clear, buoyant, confident shape—a new thing as we, his contemporaries, at once felt, and *the* new thing which made us hopeful citizens of the present and not only reverent votaries of the past.

How marvellously all this thought (which was, indeed, " incarnational " all through) found inspiration and confirmation and dignity and confidence in the Incarnation which is the astounding, paradoxical, and yet supremely natural burden of the Gospel of Jesus, Holland's writing, taken up anywhere, will impressively declare.

It was in this way, by natural affinity, deep answering to deep, and not by compromise or patching, that for him theology and philosophy met and combined. This is what explains, and in part redeems from tragedy, the " parting of friends " (Paget, pp. 51-53, 63-68) between Green and Nettleship and himself. In that pathetically beautiful and dignified biographical episode, there was, on Holland's side, no repudiation of a past, no despairing abandonment of philosophy, to find a refuge in religion. At his ordination he wrote to Green: " I could not see that I was . . . doing anything inconsistent with what I learnt from you. It seemed to me as if all the meaning I could put into my theology, and certainly my ethics, was still the old thing. Only the religious form " (the particular phrase is odd) " seemed to me to cap it all, and the cap seemed to me to fit." And the " religious form " was no mere spirit or temper, for as Holland well knew Green's " interest in philosophy was wholly religious "; but it contrasted with Green's own description of philosophy as the " reasoned intellectual expression of the effort to get to God." With all that effort, and the intellectual expression of it in Plato or Green, or their like, Holland had not, and never could have, lost reverent and admiring sympathy. He would have felt it a witness to God from within man. He would have regarded it as in a true sense prophetic, and there is no prophecy without some impulse

or revealing from God. But for Holland religion meant that of which the centre was in God's own Word and Deed revealed in Jesus Christ to satisfy questing minds and consciences and hearts. By welcoming this no line of philosophical religious discernment was dishonoured. The Gospel was as little intended to dispense with philosophy as it was to supersede conscience. But it had its utterly distinctive character: with all the lines running towards it, it was still The New Thing: and from its newness light went out, meeting, illuminating, encouraging all forms of human (or "natural") instinct, effort, and quest.

I think that this was the substance of Holland's thought. It may be illustrated by a contrast of his own. "Superstition asks faith to shut its eyes: we ask it to open them as wide as it can" (*Lux Mundi*, p. 37). And certainly no man of our time, perhaps of any time, went out with more expansive, unhampered sympathy into all the things of nature and man. He "sought unceasingly for the organic connection between the many levels and needs of human life."

In this connection we may recall his characteristic attitude to music (*Logic and Life*, pp. 49, 50). No one, hardly even Newman or Browning, has spoken of it with more insight or sympathy or absorption. And this was surely from his responsiveness to the questioning strain and effort in music to bring out something that is in nature, in man, which is real, yet more than can be expressed.

The connection of this general attitude with the social sympathies and energies which took an ever-enlarging part in Holland's life and thought is obvious, and has been brought out by Canon Richmond. Here Green had by precept and example sown rich seed. But Holland's beliefs added motive and intensity to the promptings of Green's noble and spiritual ethics.

The word "Catholic" has been put to such various, conflicting, and obscuring use that I almost shrink from introducing it. Yet it is difficult to say anything more true of Holland's soul and thought than by describing it as Catholic in all the nobler meanings of the word. The Catholic faith of Christians was in him as thankful and reverent and adoring as in the child or the peasant; but it remained so because it centred on that which for him was always and ever afresh the revealing of God's Being and of humanity's vocation, the ultimate relationship between God and man (*Fibres*, p. 41). Revealing and redeeming, it was all-sufficient for him.*

* A reader who will turn to the chapter called "The Consummation of Belief" in *Fibres of Faith*, pp. 47 ff., will find this in full and glowing clearness.

Hence his keen and deepening interest in the "preparing of the way" by the calling of the Jew, aloof on his ridge between the continents, neither Eastern nor Western, poor, afflicted, unlovely, but a vessel of choice, fashioned, hammered, forged in the furnace for the purpose of God; when in a climax of revealing and rejection the good news not for Jew only, but for all the nations, was to show itself at last, a thing of Catholic grace and truth.

But those for whom Catholic is only a word of vague though still noble use will find in Holland a mind, a heart, a soul which was, if any man's was in our day, Catholic in its open-hearted eagerness, its ready and interpretative sympathy, its trembling compassion for everything, except always what was base or mean or selfish, in the life of men and women—and children. "Can we not fling into" the dark life of to-day "our reason, our imagination, our conscience, so that we actually see what the unhappy see, and feel what the wronged feel, and burn with their indignation, and pray with their prayers?"

Can the younger generation wonder if we, his contemporaries who linger on, fret at anything which hinders from living and lasting influence the voice and power of such a prophet of truth and love?

EDW. WINTON.

II.—BENSON AT WELLINGTON

To all those who knew and admired Dr. Benson at Wellington College Mr. Bevir's little book* on the early years of the institution, which he built up and organized into one of the great Public Schools of England, is intensely interesting. To leave, as he has done, such abiding memorials of a genius for organization, and an administrative and intellectual ability of a high order in two entirely diverse paths of life, has been given to few men. Dr. Benson was a conspicuous figure both as a great headmaster and as a great Churchman. In either capacity he has set up enduring monuments of himself and his work: in that living entity, Wellington College, whose brilliant record in the Great War has in itself justified its existence; in the Cathedral of Truro, the first adequate building of the kind since the Reformation, the splendid west window of which was subscribed for by old Wellingtonians; and in the Lincoln Judgment, that masterly and unique pronouncement by the Anglican Church.

Though Benson was eminent as a headmaster, he was more

* *Dr. Benson and the Making of Wellington College*, by J. L. Bevir. Edward Arnold.

in his element and capable of even finer work as Chancellor of Lincoln, Bishop of Truro, and Primate of all England. When he left school work for Church preferment, we had no doubt whatever that in the end he could not fail to be Archbishop of Canterbury. In the present book we are concerned only with his career as headmaster. It gives a vivid and sympathetic picture of a great and inspiring personality, drawn largely from the memoranda of a keen observer of men, and an intimate colleague of the headmaster for many years—the Rev. C. W. Penny, whose name was dear to many generations of old Wellingtonians. Physically, Benson was a grand type of man, an *ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν*, cast in an heroic mould, recalling the august, though not tall, presence of an Agamemnon, as depicted by Homer's master-hand,

> *ἦ τοι μὲν κεφαλῇ καὶ μείζονες ἄλλοι ἔασι,*
> *καλὸν δ' οὔτω ἐγὼν οὔ πω ἴδον ὀφθάλμοισιν,*
> *οὐδ' οὕτω γεραρόν· βασιλῇϊ γὰρ ἀνδρὶ ἔοικε.*

In his magisterial capacity, he was sternness personified; but, when he was in a gracious mood, his charm was irresistible. Smiles and lightnings played alternately round his firm expressive lips and lighted up his striking features. He had the royal gift of never forgetting a face, and many of his old pupils remember with gratitude his kind and ever-ready help extended to them, even when he was immersed in the overwhelming duties of the Primacy.

Most writers on Dr. Benson's life, not excepting his own sons, dwell perhaps too much on his severity and "volcanic fury." Poor Penny, friend of long standing and colleague as he was, on a memorable occasion was so blasted by the breath of his displeasure that he burst into tears. But with all his masterfulness Benson had also his terrible fits of depression, that are the lot of some strong and highly-strung natures. The author of *Family Affairs* has given us an uncomfortable glimpse into these, and one such occasion is graphically described in our pages, when the man of iron will and energy and enthusiasm broke down and sobbed, because his work, like Elijah's of old, seemed a failure, just, too, when it was on the high-road to success.

In his dealing with boys Benson had the sovereign faculty, so grievously wanting in his successor, of knowing a good boy from a bad one, and the hard-working and conscientious youngster had little to fear from him even in his most terrifying moods. But woe betided the idle, the shifty, and the arrogant. He was a very Rhadamanthus when he strode into great school in the intense hush,

> *ὁ δ' ἤϊε νυκτὶ ἐοικώς,*

and folding his gown about him, caned a liar as though he were caning the devil in him—a sight never to be forgotten! Indeed to wrongdoers he was a terror incarnate, and he allowed no namby-pamby scruples about using the cane to interfere with his efficiency in those sterner days. Still, feared he might be, but he was at the same time admired and liked by the boys under him, and when he announced to his prefects his approaching departure, there was many a moist eye among his hearers.

Benson's intellect and scholarship were of a manly and vigorous cast. His lessons to the Sixth on Aristophanes or Thucydides, though not, perhaps, marked by the lecture-room finish of his successor's on Horace, were characterized by minute accuracy, no less than humour and a wide command of racy language. Some of his "fair copies" for composition were treasured up by their recipients. One version in particular, of the concluding lines in Tennyson's *Ulysses*, seems perfect of its kind. It ends:

> ἔσμεν ὅμως ὅτι ἔσμεν, ἐϋκρότου ὥστε σιδήρου,
> ἶσος ἀεὶ μένει ἀστεμφὴς ἀδαμάντινος αἰχμή.
> ἡμᾶς μὲν τρύχει δὲ χρόνος καὶ μοῖρα μαραίνει,
> ἄγναμπτον δὲ τὸ κῆρ, οἷον μενεαίνεμεν ἰθύ,
> διζῆναί τ' ἀποκρυπτὰ καὶ εὑρεῖν μηδ' ἀποεῖξαι.

Better known is his rendering of Gray's "On the Death of a Favourite Cat" with its exquisite *Delicias dominae cetera turba fugit* ("a favourite has no friend").

Though Benson's attitude in religious matters was in some respects medieval and ecclesiastical, and he is even reported to have said in later days that he would tread in the footsteps of the martyred Laud, yet he disclaimed ultra-High Church views, and certainly taught us no extreme doctrines or led us to suppose that he held them. In this connection there is an amusing ancedote recorded. A critic sent down especially by the Evangelical party (so says Mr. Bevir, but the story is generally told of a parent purposing to send his boy to the school), after attending a service in the temporary chapel, accused the headmaster of preaching Puseyite doctrines. The preacher, however, on this occasion was Kingsley, who with Temple and Hansard were the only friends, as Benson expressly stated in his repudiation of the charge, whom he had asked to preach to the boys. Poor Kingsley, after all to be accused of Puseyite proclivities! Benson's own sermons, though rather severe in type and over the heads of his congregation, were not concerned with sacraments and ceremonies and such themes, but, as he himself said, "with truth and honour, and uprightness and kindness." Everything was, indeed, done decently and in order, but without any unauthorized ritual.

In fact the same saneness and fairness of mind were shown here as in the great Lincoln Judgment.

Mr. Bevir's excellent little book brings back to a generation of old boys, now stepping one by one into the dark, lively memories of those bygone "days of our youth, which were the days of our glory." But in the nature of the case he could say nothing of the less pleasant things about the school, now hidden by the cloak of time, such as can be read in Mr. Portman's *Hugh Rendall*. A delicate, sensitive boy in the early seventies, even under such a strict, vigilant rule as Benson's, owing partly to the abominable "hostel" system of dormitories, had much to endure which cannot easily be realized to-day. Francis Thompson, in his *Shelley*, gives a picture of it, by one who has evidently gone through the ordeal, as "petty, malignant annoyance recurring hour by hour, day by day, month by month, until the accumulation becomes an agony." The strong come out of such a trial braced up, but the weak creep out, seared in their very soul. The book might with advantage have contained more reminiscences. Other sources of information could have been drawn upon. Many old Wellingtonians would have been glad to contribute their quota of memories, such as are embodied in the admirable preface by General Sir Ian Hamilton. He gives the true spirit of our school life as experienced by a boy of strong character and unusual personality. Unfortunately the two most brilliant *alumni* of the school, Verrall and Sidney Ball, had already passed over to the majority, but there were others, such as the late editor of the *Saturday Review* and the chairman of the London Hospital, who could "an they would" have told us memorable things. Perhaps the only portion of the book, which might have advantageously been omitted, is the rather unkindly mention (perhaps not wholly unmerited) of Dr. Barford. Similarly, in the *Life of Dr. Benson*, there was the attack, regretted by many, which was made on J. D. Lester, a former master of the school, whose early death extinguished a life of singular intellectual promise. He was the author of the famous "Polyphloisboisterous Homer of Old," etc., but less well known are his lines to Herodotus, which the Rev. S. N. Tebbs (misspelt in this book as *Tables*) recited to the present writer in his own inimitable style:

> Herodotus, Herodotus,
> You could not spell, you ancient cuss.
> The priests of Egypt gammoned you;
> It was not very hard to do:
> But do not think you gammon us,
> Herodotus, Herodotus.

C. R. Haines.

III.—FRANCES ARNOLD-FORSTER

Frances Arnold-Forster, who was called to rest last summer, belonged to a family distinguished alike in Church and State. Her father was William Delafield Arnold, third son of Dr. Arnold of Rugby, a friend of the Lawrences in India, and for a time Director of Education in the Punjab. But both her parents died when she was a child, and she was then adopted by her father's sister, the wife of W. E. Forster. Of her life at their home at Burley something is told below; while for many she was also part of that very fragrant Christian piety and culture which is associated with the Lakes and with Fox How. The niece at once of Matthew Arnold, the poet and critic, and of Thomas Arnold, the friend of Clough and disciple of Newman, and so the first cousin of Mrs. Humphry Ward, she seemed called to combine in her own person the love of knowledge with the love of God. And with all this she inherited also a close familiarity with practical affairs of state. Her father, W. E. Forster, was Under-Secretary for the Colonies in the Cabinet which Lord Russell formed after Palmerston's death in 1865; became Vice-President of the Council under Mr. Gladstone in 1869, in the Government which carried Irish Disestablishment; and it fell to him to introduce in the following year the Bill which was to provide us with a national system of education. Liberalism, then, was in her veins, but it was of no narrow kind; and the ardent Imperial vision of her brother, H. O. Arnold-Forster, who was Minister for War in Lord Salisbury's last Cabinet, was fully shared by the sister. Only she carried it further still to the universal Empire of Christ; and missionary interest among children a generation ago owed not a little to her first book, *Heralds of the Cross*.

This is not the place to speak of her great three-volume work on *English Church Dedications*, nor of her last work on the Psalms, which was reviewed in these columns only a few weeks before she died. To those who knew and loved her, it was her interior life of faith and courage which has left an ineffaceable impression. We might well say that she taught us the meaning of the beautiful words of Irenæus: "His sufferings are our ascension on high."

The notes published below are by a close personal friend of Miss Arnold-Forster's, who desires to remain anonymous.

E. G. Selwyn.

NOTES ON FRANCES ARNOLD-FORSTER'S LIFE AT WHARFESIDE

Frances Arnold-Forster's girlhood was passed in a world of exciting and absorbing political interests, but after the death of Mr. Forster, when she settled down to be the companion of her widowed mother in their lovely Yorkshire home, but few outward events marked her history. She had never been strong, and from this time the bridle of ill-health fettered all her activities. She was never able to undertake work that demanded continuous effort, and often for weeks at a time she was disabled; but nothing could dim her courage or hopefulness or lessen the capacity for enjoyment that made her the gayest of companions in any adventure that came within the limits of her physical powers. Except for long visits to her aunt at Fox How she but seldom left home, but nowhere was she so happy as in the library at Wharfeside, with its book-lined walls which held so many treasures, and its far-stretching outlook over the broad river Wharfe to the distant moors. In her solitary life the birds were welcome companions, and her bird-table outside the window in the long Yorkshire winters, the nesting-boxes in the plantation in spring, and the ways of the summer visitors in the river shallows were a constant source of pleasure. Outside her gates lay the busy mill village of Burley, in which she had grown up, and where "Miss Frances" was everywhere welcome. She loved to collect from the old people recollections of the days when Burley was still a hamlet lying off the main road, and local names, proverbs, expressions always awakened her ready interest. Many of the men had been members of the Bible-class of her younger days, and they could be reckoned on as willing helpers in any enterprise, missionary or parochial, while in turn they would claim her ready sympathy and advice over the problems of Sunday-school or class. Burley without Frances Arnold-Forster would, indeed, have been the poorer during the years of the war. The long list of men on active service stood in the library, and her prayers followed each individual from the training camps to the trenches, and there was no home that stood in need of comfort or sympathy but could count on her presence. From the first week of the war she collected from the local papers and from every other available source particulars of the Burley soldiers—their training, their wounds, their bravery, their honours—and the big volumes of newspaper cuttings are now in the keeping of the District Council, and can be borrowed by any man who wants to retrace the history of his comrades and his corps. It was a very valuable contribution to local history.

Outside her own home, one of her great interests in later years was the Vacation Term for Biblical Study. She went as a student to one of its early meetings at Girton, and she at once made her mark. Lecturers found in her a scholar whose appreciation of their teaching made itself apparent in the so-called "Conversation Classes" with which each course concludes; her help was claimed for study and discussion, her pen was enlisted for writing reports, and her friendship was sought by old and young. She brought with her not only a keen and playful mind, a power of intense enjoyment, and a delight in exploring new minds, but above all a deep spiritual force of which no one could fail to be conscious in her presence, and which manifested itself supremely in her Greek Testament readings. She prepared most carefully for these readings, and read

widely, but her conclusions were always her own, and were valued for their originality and insight.

At her first Vacation Term the Lambeth Diploma for Women was just about to be launched, and Frances Arnold-Forster became one of its earliest candidates. All her scholarly instincts responded to the preparation under expert guidance, and it was a great enrichment of her powers of helping others. She was a born teacher, beginning almost as a child to take a class in the Sunday-school, and later in the school for half-timers in her father's mills, and nothing gave her keener pleasure than to gather round her study circles of the educated girls in her own neighbourhood. Two or three study-guides prepared for these Wharfeside circles have been published and made available for wider use, and her last book, *The Hymn-book of the Church*, reviewed this year in THEOLOGY, was the outcome of a circle which met to study the Psalter under her guidance. She had a talent for anticipating and meeting the difficulties of thoughtful but unlearned minds, and she delighted in opening the doors of a new study. She was quick to see the latent possibilities and capabilities in her pupils, and many of them were helped to undertake enterprises which they had never dreamed were within their powers by her confidence in them.

Many a disciple was added to the ever-lengthening list of her friends, the friends to whom she gave in such overflowing measure, and whose fortunes she followed so closely. Surely it cannot be amiss to believe that in "the classroom of the saints," in which she herself will be learning such new and wonderful truths, some souls, less expert than herself in spiritual things, must even now be finding in her guidance and sympathy and counsel ?

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

We have received from Australia the official account of an important Conference on Reunion held at Adelaide last May, when the Bishop of Adelaide introduced the Lambeth proposals of 1920. The meeting seems to have been representative of the principal religious bodies in the Commonwealth, with the exception of the Orthodox Church and the Church of Rome; and all the clauses of a resolution embodying Section 6 of the Lambeth Appeal and the practical recommendation in Section 7 were carried, either unanimously or by large majorities. Curiously enough, the question of Creed appears to have given rise to more discussion than that of the Ministry. The welcome extended to the Lambeth proposals goes further than any we have yet heard of in other parts of the world; and the resumption of the Conference next year will be looked forward to with much hope and prayer.

We have had some correspondence from Dr. Cooper and Dr. Wotherspoon with regard to an editorial note in our August issue. Commenting on the Montreal Reunion proposals, we said that we understood that "Scottish opinion would prefer some simple form of conditional ordination, if, as seems to be the case, local circumstances make 'the precedents of 1610' inapplicable." We think that the context made it clear that the reference was to Canada, not to Scotland; but we are glad to be reminded that in Scotland, where the presbyteral succession has been carefully kept, "the precedents of 1610" are still looked to as the best means of integrating their ministry and ours. The matter is dealt with in an article by Dr. Wotherspoon in the *Constructive Quarterly* for June, 1921. It must be recognized that this method is not that of the Lambeth resolutions of 1920, though it was alluded to as a possible method by the Lambeth Conference of 1908. If the result of the last Lambeth appeal were to elicit from the Church of Scotland a firm offer of procedure by means of "the precedents of 1610," a new and important situation in the Reunion movement would have arisen. Meanwhile, we may refer to an historical survey of those "precedents" in the *Church Quarterly* for July, 1920.

Another note in the August number provoked a protest from Mr. W. C. Bishop in the *Church Times*, who objected to our plea that, if a revised English liturgy should contain an Invocation of the Holy Spirit, this should come before, rather than after, the words of Institution. In what we wrote, we were seeking order, edification, and peace; and we are still of opinion that the introduction of a consecratory *epiclesis* after the oblation would introduce a needless confusion into our ways of worship. Generations of Church-people have lived and died for whom the words of Institution mark the focus and climax of devotional activity; and, apart from any other questions, that is a custom not lightly to be disturbed. To an Invocation before the words of Institution, as in the Prayer-Book of 1549, there would, on the other hand, be no such objection; and, though we do not ourselves feel the need of it, we should be prepared to support it if it would satisfy the needs of others. The vital point, in our judgment, is to secure such a revision of the Canon at an early date as will render unnecessary the unauthorized—though, in themselves,

perfectly harmless—enrichments which many priests introduce when celebrating. No doubt this would not meet all the existing anomalies: it is quite likely that the existence of "peculiars" would have to be recognized, where the Roman rite or something very like it was used with certain safeguards. But at least the situation would have been cleared; and hundreds of clergy, who now interpolate in one way or another, would find all that they needed in the authorized liturgy of *Ecclesia Anglicana*.

Queen Anne's Bounty, by W. R. Le Fanu (Macmillan, 1s.), is a short history and guide to the present working of an institution which affects all the beneficed clergy of England. The last book on the subject was written in 1826, so that the present one is long overdue. The price puts it within the reach of all, and those who have dealings with Q.A.B. could not invest a shilling more profitably.

Oremus.

Hymn for the Faithful Departed

For all who die in faith and fear,
Our supplication, Jesu, hear;
O pitying Jesu, Saviour blest,
Grant unto them eternal rest.

We know they would not, if they might,
Return to this world's lesser light,
For richer wisdom now is theirs,
Their souls are free from earthly cares.

And though no sin may enter in
Where they lament the deeds of sin,
Yet on each chastened soul outpour
Enabling grace to love Thee more.

From grace to grace may they progress
To perfect state of holiness,
Till to Thy likeness they attain
For evermore with Thee to reign.

On all the souls departed hence
In faith, and love, and penitence—
On them bestow, O Jesu blest,
Perpetual light, eternal rest. Amen.

PAPERS FOR THE PRIESTHOOD

A.—DEVOTION

By Rev. W. B. Trevelyan, formerly Warden of Liddon House

V.—CONTEMPLATION

It is almost impossible at this point to turn aside from the subject of Mystical Theology and of Contemplation. Mystical Theology is described as being an experience, not a science. It is the direct, secret, incommunicable knowledge of God received in contemplation, as opposed to natural theology and dogmatic theology.

It is obviously impossible to deal at all fully with these subjects in such brief papers as these. The following brief list of books, however, will provide at any rate an introduction:

Article on "Mysticism" by Dom J. Chapman in *Dictionary of Religion and Ethics.*
Fr. Baker's *Holy Wisdom.*
An Introduction to the Mystical Life, by Le Jeune. Translated from the French. (Washbourne.)
The Psychology of the Saints, by Joly. Translated from the French. (Duckworth.)
Walter Hilton's *Scale of Perfection.* (End of thirteenth century.)
Life of St. Theresa, by herself. (Thomas Baker.)
Baron von Hügel's *Mystical Element of Religion.*

The Danger of Discouragement

"The path of the just is as the shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day." These words from the Book of Proverbs may well bring courage and hope to those (and they are many) who are discouraged in the life of prayer by seeming lack of progress, or held back by contentment with things as they are. Neither hopelessness nor over-contentment can be right. They imply a certain faithlessness, and doubt of the faculties with which God has endowed us. They suggest, too, an absence of desire. He who says "Seek ye My face" must be waiting for the response from each one of us, "Thy face, Lord, will I seek." It is true, however, that in all such deep matters we must preserve self-mistrust and strive after a growing humility. Moreover, we shall need guidance and many precautions; light, also, may be slow in coming, even if the light we desire seems to come to us in this world at all. But desires are never worthless, each one is known to the searcher of hearts, and they must surely lead to clearer vision some day—"Visio Dei vita hominis."

Two Difficulties

There are two mistakes which may easily hinder us: (1) The fear lest a much fuller experience of the life of prayer and closer union with God are only for the few. (2) That any advance in the mystical life is incompatible with external activities.

(1) The mystical faculty is not the property only of the few. Many think that such experiences are of necessity confined to the saints. But Fr. Tyrrell (*Faith of the Millions,* page 61) says: "The saint is a man whose whole life is wrapt up and permeated with the love of God. In other words, the saint differs from the ordinary Christian, not in his mysticism, but in the degree of his mysticism." The saint, then, is intelligible to us in all that which is the essence of his sanctity. In *Oil and Wine* (page 227) Fr. Tyrrell says: "True mysticism simply emphasizes and gives the first importance to that direct and experimental knowledge of God which is possessed by all, but little heeded."

The true mystic, then, is not a man who differs from the rest of us, but one who has cultivated to the utmost of his power that faculty which we all possess, though from one cause or other in so many of us it lies dormant and unused. The mystic may or may not have visions, ecstasies and the like: that is to most of them a small matter—indeed, a thing to be dreaded and mistrusted rather than desired.

We may sum this up by some important words of St. Bonaventura, known as "the prince of mystical theologians": "The mystical experience belongs to the *Lex communis,* and is not an exception, privilege, or miracle. . . ." "In my opinion," he says, "this manner of knowledge is to be sought by every just man in this life."

These words suggest the question: "Why, if this is the case, do so few of us have these deeper experiences?" It may be that more persons have them than we think, or that many of us miss them because we do not expect them, or think them impossible for such ordinary Christians as ourselves. This cannot be if, as the saints tell us, we possess the needful faculties.

The second point alluded to must wait for another month; so must such matters as the moral requirements for contemplation, its difficulties, the time for making changes in our religious practices, etc.

B.—IN THE STUDY

By Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke, B.D., Edit. Sec. of S.P.C.K.

V.—AN OLD TESTAMENT BOOK

This month we give some suggestions as to the study of an Old Testament book. Let us take the earliest complete document, the prophet Amos. The concluding verses are frequently assigned to a later date, and some of the documents which make up the Pentateuch and the historical books are on any theory prior to Amos. But this does not alter the unique importance of Amos as a firm standing-place in the shifting sands of Old Testament criticism.

Let us try to approach the book with unprejudiced eyes, as if we had a general knowledge of Old Testament problems, and Amos was a newly discovered document. Suppose we take as a working hypothesis the famous Graf-Wellhausen dictum that the Prophets precede the Law, the general enunciation of religious principles coming before their codification into a system. We hold, let us say, an evolutionary theory—namely, that Israel was first polytheistic, then went through a stage of monolatry (worshipping Yahweh only, but acknowledging the sovereignty of the gods of the surrounding nations in their own sphere), and finally advanced to true monotheism. We eagerly study the new document and test our hypothesis by it. First we write an account of the nature, character, and power of God as they appear here. (We do not forget that the LORD, printed thus in capitals, represents in our English Bible the personal name Yahweh.) The conception is clearly very lofty and wonderful. Is there any indication that Amos was an innovator? "The hearing ear is always found close to the speaking tongue," says Emerson of the England which produced Shakespeare, and it is highly improbable that such sermons as these of Amos were preached unless there were many with ears attuned to hear them. Then was the community he addressed polytheistic, monolatrous, or monotheistic? Or if the question is improperly phrased, were there sufficient minds prepared to receive higher teaching about God to ensure that the prophet was not wasting his words?

Next it will be helpful to collect any passages which refer to the past history of Israel, either to historical events or to a law. A Revised Version with references will be useful here. Is any light thrown on the vexed questions of a central sanctuary at Jerusalem and the problem of Deuteronomy? The search for legal references may yield scanty results, but we may reflect, would a preacher to-day intent upon social problems say much in a short book about legal matters either in Church or State? Or do the Babylonian Penitential Psalms show any knowledge of the Code of Hammurabi and its successors? (Both are obtainable from S.P.C.K. for a few pence.)

Before we pass on to other subjects we shall do well to study commentaries. Sir George Adam Smith's inspiring treatment of the Minor Prophets in the *Expositor's Bible* is most valuable, and Dr. Driver in the *Cambridge Bible for Schools* gives all the help that anyone not a specialist requires. But I believe it is the most profitable method of study to read a book first without commentaries, and, trusting mainly to common sense, to write down one's conclusions. The next stage is to study what experts have written for our guidance.

Lastly, let us read what we wrote first and see in what respects it needs alteration in the light of our fuller knowledge.

C.—PASTORAL WORK

By Rev. J. J. G. Stockley, Rector of Wolverhampton

V.—THE TEACHING AND TRAINING OF CHILDREN

I

One feels that it is almost impossible to write anything new or valuable on this subject. Pamphlets and books on education have of late years literally poured from the press, and one feels that if only a small fraction of the excellent theories of teaching and training children had been put into practice, education—and especially religious education—would be in a much healthier condition to-day than, as a matter of fact, it is.

For we are all heartily dissatisfied with what we have managed to accomplish. When the young people in our parishes come for their Confirmation preparation classes, how few are the children who have received any real grounding in religious knowledge, and the necessity of habits of religious practice. And how *very* small is the number who have any deep sense of God's Presence with them in the varying experiences of their daily lives.

And yet, by the very fact of the Church teaching that infant baptism is allowable and right, we are all implicitly pledged to the view that the "little children" can in very deed, and consciously, be brought to Jesus Christ. The ordinary view of the secular world that religion, in a serious sense, is only for grown-up people is utterly abhorrent to Christianity. The words of the Master hold good and can be demonstrated through experience—"Except ye turn, and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter the Kingdom of Heaven" (Matt. xviii. 3).

It is, then, part of our faith to hold that children can not only receive religious instruction—*i.e.*, know the main facts and doctrines of the Christian and Catholic Creed—but that they can be taught to love and serve God in the following of Jesus Christ by the aid of the Divine Spirit.

I am well aware of the usual objection brought against our attempts to make religion a reality in the lives of boys and girls. We are told that it is not natural, that childhood is essentially the time of thoughtlessness and careless freedom, that children will, if religion is pressed upon them, be wearied and sickened of the whole thing long before they grow up. And instances of this are easily produced.

At first I am ready to allow that, on the face of it, the objectors seem to have a very good case. Children are, undoubtedly, often bored and sickened with religion before they become men and women. But why? Is it because the attempt to make them religious was necessarily doomed to fail? Or is it because the particular presentation of religion to the child

was, psychologically, false, and, *therefore*, certain to lose its power during adolescence ? I feel convinced that the latter explanation is the true one.

Children's minds have been crammed with facts and statements—often wholly disconnected—about Christianity. Not only in the teaching of the Old Testament, but in the teaching of the New, there has been little effort to illuminate the child's mind and touch the heart. I know that a very decided and genuine improvement is taking place, but there is still the awful and gloomy tradition in our midst that religion is at the best rather a dull affair. So many children—and, I am afraid, adults, too—are taught to suspect anything in religion that savours of freshness of ideas, joyous and full life, bright colour, buoyant vigour and happiness. And yet Christ our Saviour came to deliver us all from sin and gloom so that we might, having life, have it " more abundantly." The fact is that, though we have given up Puritan beliefs, the Puritan heritage of what is allowed and what is forbidden still stains our imagination. Old taboos die hard.

The aim, then, of all religious teaching is not merely to instruct children about religion, but, co-operating with the Spirit of God, to influence children to know and love God in their lives.

Of course, instruction in facts and doctrines is necessary. The Old Testament wisely used is a vast storehouse of incidents, stories, great prophecies, poems—all written with the upward look to God gradually revealing Himself to humanity through the chosen race. And the Gospels should be regularly taught and explained in a vital and practical manner as the very heart of God's Message of Love given in Jesus Christ. The Church Catechism, too, more suited for older than for younger children, should always be taught in such a way as to make the children realize that the instruction given is linked on to their lives is each succeeding stage. [Here may I add my personal conviction that we sorely need a longer and simpler Catechism—to supplement our present one. Something of the nature of the Penny Catechism of the Roman Church is required. That Catechism is admirable. Bishop Knox (late Bishop of Manchester) describes it as " a remarkably clear document, with well-constructed questions and answers."]

But instruction in facts and doctrines will not, of itself, make a child wish to love and serve God. We cannot too often be reminded that " a child's mind is not a vase to be filled, but a fire to be kindled." Just as in so-called secular education if a boy or girl leaves school with no *desire* to know more and think better, his or her education, so far, is a failure, so, if our children when they leave our Sunday Schools and Catechisms have no real religion in their hearts, no wish to serve God in the Membership of Christ's Holy Church—well, in such cases, the teachers have failed. The child may have gained accurate and extensive knowledge of what religion is. If he does not *want* to practise religion that knowledge will soon become to him useless lumber—to be forgotten and got rid of.

" We must understand," writes Froebel in his *Education of Man*, " that children reach Divine Truth, not through and in the thought, but through and in the heart; and that religious spirit and fervid life in God and with God, in all conditions and circumstances of life and of the human mind, will hardly in later years rise to full, vigorous life, if it has not grown up with man from infancy. On the other hand, a religious spirit thus

fostered and nursed from infancy will rise supreme in all dangers and storms of life."

How then, in what spheres—by what methods—are the children of God to become aware of their most precious heritage, and be taught to serve Him "Whom to serve is to rule"? The spheres are plainly, (1) the Home, and then (2) the Day School, (3) the Catechism, (4) the Sunday School.

(1) The Home is the first and natural sphere in which the Christian child should be taught and trained. This simple and obvious statement of fact is nowadays almost completely forgotten. Average parents *in all classes*, while acknowledging their obligation to care for the child's bodily welfare, to feed, clothe, and shelter the growing boy or girl, have almost unanimously decided that the mental and spiritual training of those to whom they have given life can, from beginning to end, be carried out much better by other people. The State or the Church, through elementary Schools, Sunday Schools, etc., are entrusted with the responsibility. In the "upper classes" the Preparatory and afterwards the Public School will do all that is necessary for mind and soul. Leave the whole thing to the experts. Why interfere or worry about it?

I believe that Christian teachers—and, indeed, the Church of Christ as a whole—should constantly and, if possible, effectively, combat this most unnatural and disastrous view. The Christian home and family is the God-ordained unit of human life and society. Parents can *never* shift and get rid of their responsibility for the teaching and training of their children—especially in matters touching relationship to God, character, essential life.

Of course, what is attempted in the home must be supplemented by teachers and guides of knowledge and experience. The Church, the School, the Catechism—all should do their part. But it is sheer folly for parents, or for the Church, or for the State and educational authorities, to acquiesce in the slothful surrender of the ideal of the home as the first and necessary training-ground of character. As a matter of fact, in a sense, the surrender cannot be made. For home influence is never merely negative. What is rightly done for the young by Church or School cannot be ignored in the home. As all priests and lay teachers well know, the homes that give no help are always a hindrance. In the end the home must be the strongest influence for good or evil in the child's life, especially when it approaches adolescence. And, as in so many other departments of thought and life, Christian ideals are found to be the only workable ones. We must relearn the Wisdom of Him Who for the three years' ministry passed thirty years in the Home of Nazareth. The Christian Society must regain the Ideal of the Christian Home.

(The next Paper will deal with Day Schools, Sunday Schools, and Catechisms.)

D.—CIVIC RELATIONS OF THE MINISTRY

By Miss A. Deane, O.B.E.

IV.—NATIONAL INSURANCE.

The National Insurance Act was passed in 1911: Part I. deals with compulsory Health Insurance, and Part II. with compulsory Unemployment Insurance. The whole question is so big that it will be difficult to put the essential facts together in a limited space.

Voluntary Insurance had been carried on by Friendly Societies, Industrial Insurance Companies, Collecting Friendly Societies, and the Trade Unions. In the provisions of the National Health Insurance Acts, 1911–1920, the rules which govern the relations of insured persons and Approved Societies are laid down, and the provisions of the Act are binding on all members and their Societies.

Who, then, are the insured persons under the Health Insurance Act ?

All who are working and are sixteen years old, and who do not hold certificates of exemption, are called " Employed Contributors." There are besides " Voluntary Contributors," who are those who have been employed and insured 104 weeks, and who wish to continue to be insured, paying the whole contribution themselves, and giving notice of the wish to do so to the Society to which they belong. From July 5, 1920, the weekly contribution that employed contributors have to pay is, men 10d. and women 9d.

When a person is exempt and has been granted an Exemption Certificate, the rate is 5d.

The employer may deduct from wages 5d. for a man and 4d. for a woman. An employer has to pay a contribution every week for each week during the whole or any part of which the worker is employed.

People who are exempt from compulsory insurance are apprentices who receive no money payment, anybody employed on an agricultural holding without money payment, persons employed by their parents without money being paid them, or anybody fully maintained by an employer but not paid, and wives employed by their husbands or husbands employed by their wives.

Persons who are in receipt of £250 and not employed in manual labour are exempt, also teachers employed in recognized service and entitled to benefits under the School Teachers (Superannuation) Act, 1918, and pupil or student teachers employed in a public Elementary School.

Where a Department has issued a certificate that the terms of employment secure benefits in sickness and disablement equivalent to those under the Act no contributions need be paid in by persons in the employment of the Crown.

Persons in the employment of local or other public authorities, clerks or salaried officials in the service of a railway or other statutory company, who are entitled to rights in a superannuation fund established by Act of Parliament.

The benefits to which an ordinary insured person is entitled are Medical, Sickness, Disablement, and Maternity benefits. In Ireland there is no medical benefit, but sanatorium benefit is provided.

Medical Benefit consists of the provision of medical attendance and treatment, and it includes treatment and attendance for tuberculosis, medicine and medical appliances. It does not include medical attendance or treatment in respect of a confinement.

Sickness and disablement benefit is made by periodical payments, during incapacity for work of which notice has been given, and after four days may be paid for a period not exceeding 26 weeks in all, and these benefits are paid by the Approved Society of which the insured person is a member, and the insured person must have paid contributions for 26 weeks, and 26 contributions must have been paid in respect of him.

Maternity benefit consists in the payment of 40s. on the confinement of the wife of an insured man or of a woman, whether married or un-

married, if she is herself insured, and is paid by the Approved Society concerned with whom all the details of benefit are arranged. The benefit must in all cases be dealt with in the interests of the mother and the child. Sickness, disablement, or maternity benefit is not payable to any person while such person is in a hospital or an institution supported by charity or out of the public funds.

If a person is receiving compensation or damages under the Workmen's Compensation Act, they do not receive insurance benefit, and a disabled sailor or soldier or airman in receipt of pension has reduced benefit.

The ordinary rates of sickness benefit are, men 15s. per week and women 12s. Sickness benefit before 104 weeks from entry into insurance and payment of 104 contributions, men 9s. and women 7s. 6d. Disablement benefit is 7s. 6d. for both men and women, and maternity benefit is 40s. Non-manual workers paid less than £250 a year must be insured, and *all* manual workers, whatever they are paid.

The Ministry of Health Insurance Department is responsible for the administration of Part I. of the National Insurance Act, and the Ministry of Labour is responsible for the administration of Part II., which is Unemployment Insurance. A New Act was passed in 1920 in respect of Part II. repealing the previous Acts. There was another Act in 1921, which was amended July 1, 1921, and is law at the present time.

The scheme was the outcome of expert investigation, and is bound up closely with the whole question of Unemployment. The first Act only included a certain limited number of trades, but on November 8, 1920, it was extended to all included in the scheme of Health Insurance with the exception of those engaged in agriculture and private domestic service, or those in the Navy, Army, and Air Service, or Established Civil Servants, or to certain persons employed by local or public authorities, those who come under a statutory Superannuation Fund, and persons not working at manual labour, and in receipt of £250 a year. Anyone in doubt as to whether they come under the Act or not can obtain the information at once at any Employment Exchange, and if they are not satisfied can fill up a form and apply to the Minister of Labour for a decision.

Provision is made under the Act by which an industry may, subject to certain conditions, contract out of the general scheme by setting up a special scheme of its own for dealing with unemployment. Provision is also made for any industry which does not set up a special scheme to make a supplementary scheme for the provision of benefits additional to those provided under the general scheme.

The method of paying contributions is the same for all employed persons—that is, by means of special Unemployment Insurance stamps, representing the joint contributions of employer and worker, purchased by the employer and affixed by him to an unemployment book, this book having been first obtained by the worker and handed to the employer, and the issue and exchange of these books is the responsibility of the Ministry of Labour and not of any Association or Society.

Benefit may be claimed in two ways, either direct from an Employment Exchange or Branch Employment Office, or through an Association or Society which has been authorized under certain rules and regulations to become the channel for distributing benefit to its own members.

The present contributions are: men of the age of 18 and upwards 7d. and employer's share 8d., women of 18 and upwards 6d. and employer's

share 7d., boys aged 16 and upwards 3½d. and employer 4d., and girls aged 16 and upwards 3d. and employer 3½d. each week.

The present rates of benefit are, men 15s. a week or 2s. 6d. a day, women 12s. a week or 2s. a day, boys 7s. 6d. a week or 1s. 3d. a day, girls 6s. a week or 1s. a day. The State pays in contributions weekly, men 3¾d., women 3¼d., boys 1½d., girls 1⅝d.

It would take too long to enumerate all the different regulations with regard to the payment of benefit. Owing to the abnormal conditions prevailing in industry at the present time, the special periods during which an insured person may receive benefit have been extended, but the maximum periods of benefit in any future insurance year were stated in the first Act of 1921 to be 26 weeks, and in order to obtain benefit insured persons must be able to prove that they have been employed in insurable work, they must have paid at least 20 contributions since the beginning of the last preceding insurance year, and must be genuinely seeking whole-time employment.

When the extended scheme of Unemployment Insurance was started in November, 1920, the Fund had been built up through nine years of good employment, and by the steady contributions of employers and workers in a limited number of insured trades. There was every hope that there would be plenty of work for everybody during the period of reconstruction after the War, but the contrary has proved to be the case. Amongst other things the industrial unrest and the coal stoppage have produced an abnormal condition in industry, and it was very soon found that thousands of men and women and juveniles up and down the country would be unemployed, and these had for the most part only lately come under the Unemployment Scheme, but had just paid sufficient contributions to entitle them to benefit for their first year. When people say hard things about the numbers receiving Unemployment Insurance, they should remember that the greater number of those in receipt of it are insured workers who have paid their contributions, many of them for years, and all of them have made some contribution; also that by law they have been compelled to come under the Act.

It would take too long to go into the hundred and one safeguards which are employed to prevent fraud of any sort, and how very strict in reality is the test applied to find out if people are genuinely seeking employment. It is perhaps, forgotten by those who have not gone thoroughly into the scheme that it is, indeed, a bona-fide Insurance, and that at the age of sixty an insured contributor, having paid a certain minimum number of contributions, and satisfied certain conditions, is entitled to have repaid to him from the Unemployment Fund his share of the contributions paid in respect of him, with compound interest at 2½ per cent., less any unemployment benefit he may have received from the Unemployment Fund.

National Insurance was a vast matter to take in hand, and no one will claim that the last word has been said with regard to it. It has received a great deal of ill-informed criticism, but there is evidence that even this is really helpful, and that we may look for constructive developments when the present abnormal state of things has passed away.

REVIEW

VON HARNACK'S MARCION

MARCION: DAS EVANGELIUM VOM FREMDEN GOTT. Eine Monographie zur Geschichte der Grundlegung der Katholischen Kirche. Von Adolph von Harnack. Leipzig. 50 m. 1921.

IN the years before the war Professor Harnack held a unique position in the estimation of English theologians. Those who read German and were interested in technical details knew a score or more of his books or contributions to magazines which were indispensable to specialists. But all his books of general interest were translated and found a ready sale. The *History of Dogma* was a massive work, which by itself would have made a scholar's reputation international. *What is Christianity?* had a considerable vogue among the laity. The conception of Christianity set forth lacked much of what to English Churchmen seemed part of the faith, but within its limits was a book of the highest value. I remember the thrill with which I read its definition of religion: "Eternal life in the midst of time before the eyes and in the strength of God." These noble lectures, delivered in a Berlin hall packed by University students, were a valuable testimony to true religion amid materialistic surroundings. After a while we began to realize that Liberal Protestantism in Germany was moving to quite new positions. The intensive study of Christian origins was proving that the Church was Catholic from the first. No longer could it be said, *Ab initio non sic erat*, for such a beginning, granted that it existed at all, was removed from our gaze. The degeneracy, if such it was, is already visible in the earliest Christian documents, and the Apostles were responsible. Harnack's splendid *Expansion of Christianity* made this new standpoint clear to English readers. But, perhaps, what appealed to us most of all was his series of books on Lukan problems, in which he paid a handsome tribute to English scholars, especially Ramsay, Hobart, and Hawkins, and had the courage to defy the critical verdicts of German scholars by dating the Synoptic Gospels and the Acts even earlier than many conservative English scholars dared to date them. Then came the war, and we thought of other things.

Perhaps the secret of Harnack's influence in England lay in the fact that he conformed to our ideal of a scholar. In spite of his deep learning, he is far from being a narrow specialist.

We instinctively distrust a scholar whose activities are confined within his study walls. The broad humanity of Harnack, and the part played by him in German social and political life, made him in our eyes a figure very different from the typical German professor, and in consequence a leader who inspired confidence.

This is a lengthy preamble to a review, but it is desirable that we should realize the importance of the writer before we proceed to examine his book. Probably we underrate the importance of German theology now as much as we—or some of us—overrated it seven years ago. But Professor von Harnack is still the world's outstanding theologian, and a new full-length book by him is an event in the world of thought. The publication of *Marcion* has been almost contemporaneous with the author's seventieth birthday, which has been celebrated with great rejoicings in Germany despite the political and economic preoccupations of the time.

The book is an exhaustive study of Marcion and the Marcionites. Much of it is of great interest to specialists, but too detailed for discussion in this journal. We shall confine ourselves to such parts as have a broad appeal. These will now be summarized.

Christianity grew out of late Judaism, and was syncretistic and Catholic from the first. It took over from Judaism a mass of complexities and contradictions, which, hitherto subordinated to the simplicity of the old faith, had now to be worked up into a logical system. The process began inevitably as soon as Christianity reached Greek soil. The Old Testament, *and especially the Creation story*, converted the Greeks; cosmology was the master thought to begin with. The vast mass of ideas taken on by the Church was not mastered or successfully worked into a logical system until the time of the schoolmen. But from the first individuals essayed simplification—they were called heretics. The first heretics fell back on myths and mysteries, the Church on " the faith " and " the apostolic tradition "; there was as yet no theology. Christianity on its final separation from Judaism was in a most difficult position, formless and uncrystallized, bound to the Old Testament, but puzzled by it. The Christians did not know whether they were Jews or not. Confronting them were eminent teachers offering a simple faith of redemption through Christ and higher Greek thought. Then Marcion arose to free Christendom from the impasse, and to offer his own simplification, based not on syncretism but on a Biblical theology.

Marcion came from Sinope in Pontus to Rome, where he stayed for a while quietly working at his Biblical text and the

Antitheses (139-144). Then, a Luther before his time, he accused the Roman Church of Judaism and was rejected. He began his propaganda, which by 150 had spread widely. He lived at most till 159.

Marcion's point of departure was the Pauline contrast of Law and Gospel, Judgment and Love, which, sharpened to an excess, led to the rejection of the Old Testament. Having lost this he had to establish his case with the help of certain Christian writings which enjoyed a high, if not quite canonical, position at Rome.

We now come to his work as a Biblical critic. He started from a theory of a conspiracy against truth and an elaborate falsification of documents in the Jewish interest. Galatians shows that there was but one Gospel and that the Judaisers were actively at work. Therefore Paul's Gospel and his letters must be free from Judaism; any Judaistic passages must be interpolations. There must be an authentic written Gospel written by Paul (the other Apostles had failed to understand Christ and had relapsed into Judaism) after his assumption to the third heaven. Marcion's task was to restore the true text of this Gospel. He took Luke as his basis, probably because his was the only or best known Gospel in Pontus. His next task was to restore the Pauline epistles.

Here von Harnack discusses the alterations made in these books by Marcion. The motives are classified; among them we note the following: The Creator and God of the Old Testament must not appear as the Father of Christ—the Old Testament prophecies of Christ are to be understood literally, of temporal blessings—Christ is never Judge but always Saviour —He has not fulfilled but abrogated the law—He will not reappear as Judge, but will at the end of the days declare the already accomplished great separation.

Was Marcion honest? His mentality is a psychological puzzle which we can understand better when we see what modern critics have made of the Bible. Take a radical critic of to-day, make him naïve instead of sophisticated, deprive him of his knowledge of historical principles, and you will get Marcion. (This verdict is particularly instructive, originating whence it does.) After all Marcion's treatment of the tradition was hardly more drastic than John's.

Marcion's great book was the *Antitheses*, or explanations of passages, the authorized book of the Marcionites, without which their bible could not be safely used. It is specially important to note that his polemic is always against the Old Testament, never against the New, *because the latter was not in existence.*

We now get to grips with Marcion's system, which has to be

discovered from his exegesis. He claimed no special revelation, and kept closely to his reduced bible. The keynote is soteriology. The gospel is salvation from the world *and its maker*. This attitude towards the world means that the world hates his followers—herein is their bliss. The creator is not an Ahriman but simply the creator as revealed in the Old Testament. Jesus calls him "the corrupt tree." The world is bad not so much because matter is evil but because its maker is evil. The creator showed his evil nature in creating man so weak and helpless, allowing his fall, being cruel and warlike, visiting the sins of fathers upon children, showing partiality to his own people. He is just, in the sense that a despot is just; and like a despot exacts obedience as a primary virtue. He was ignorant of the other God's existence. His essence is identical with that of the world. Specially repulsive is the method of propagation instituted by him. Note that the good God has no part in creation, even the soul is breathed into man by the demiurge.

Having created man, god (the difference of spelling is convenient) lost him. He then tried to win him back through the Jews; the heathen he dealt with only indirectly. The law, however, is good on a lower plane; Marcion is not an antinomian. The Old Testament *malgré lui* contains some forecasts of the good God. But the Jewish Messiah is not Jesus, only an earthly conqueror, whom the Jews are justified in expecting still.

So much for god. The Saviour-God came as a new and strange God hitherto unknown, and only knowable through revelation. He dwelt in the third heaven (He had created a heaven and earth of His own, unattainable to our senses), and showed His superior power by His descent through god's heaven, His power over god's elements, and over hell. This Saviour-God is Love: the word sums Him up perfectly. He came to save all mankind, from god, from the law. Marcion was a Modalist—Christ differed from the Father only in name. It follows that He did not appear on earth till His saving work began. Marcion was a Docetist, too, but the full consequences of Docetism were not drawn. Though Christ had no human flesh, He was not a ghost, but appeared, suffered, and died "in the likeness of men." The angels who ate with Abraham show how this was possible for the thought of the ancients. Great importance was attached to Christ's invasion of the underworld. Adam, Enoch, Moses, Abraham, etc., were not saved—they could not extricate themselves from their belief in the Jewish god. But the wicked heathen, already so severely punished by god, ran to meet the Saviour and were rescued.

Christ bought all humanity from god by His death; god had pronounced a curse on the cross, which he had not intended for *his* Messiah. It was necessary to buy men, for they were god's property.

We note further that Christ failed with many when on earth, as, for example, with the Twelve; only Paul responded properly. He saves only the soul, not the flesh. Even the saved are under bondage to god so long as they are in the present world and are persecuted by him. Finally, the bad will go with god to a temporary fire where they and he will be burned away, and only the good God and the saved will remain.

Marcion, starting out to restore true religion, unwittingly founded a new religion. The Marcionite Church was a factor of great importance for a long period. Marcion held very high views of the Church, and in many respects adhered to traditional usages. The Sacraments were practised in the ordinary way, save that water took the place of wine in the Eucharist. There is no sign of ecstatic or Montanist phenomena. Adherents were won from the Great Church, not from the heathen, nor by the natural growth of the community, for marriage and the intercourse of married persons were alike forbidden, in order to defy the demiurge. The one Gospel and the reduced Pauline corpus formed the holy book of the Marcionites at a time when the Great Church had nothing more than the Old Testament and a number of Christian documents of uncertain authority. The Marcionite Church was organized throughout the empire before the Catholic Church. In the period 150-190 it was a regular counter-church against which Catholicism had to fight; the theology of the Church Fathers is largely anti-Marcionite by origin. The danger was over by 250 in the West, where Marcionism was eventually swallowed up by Manichæanism, but remained in the East till about 450, after which time it receded.

The reader will have recognized much that is familiar in this summary of a famous heresy; its bearing on modern controversies hardly needs pointing out. Von Harnack does not shrink from this part of his task. Marcion is to him a hero, the prototype of Protestants. Much in Marcionism awakens no response, for it is the trappings of a bygone age, but his fundamental conceptions when expressed in modern language make a strong appeal to the author, whose conclusions may be summarized thus.

Marcion's opponents made the mistake of pouring new wine into old bottles and treating Old and New Testament as a unity, thus denying the essence of the Gospel. Marcion was *Paulus redivivus*, for the Apostle would have been horrified at second-

century Christendom, as exhibited, for example, in the *Shepherd* of Hermas. Paul substituted *Kyrios Christos* for the Messiah, and taught that all things had become new. He saved the Old Testament by allegorical interpretation and clever dialectic. Without these his system fails and his followers would be driven to Marcion's position. "John," in whom we find Jesus as the God of Love driving out fear, a Saviour and not a Judge, the world in the power of evil, all before Jesus robbers and murderers, is the half-way house between Paul and Marcion. If Marcion founded his system on Galatians, then no certain traditions forbidding his conclusions could have existed. There was no uniform tradition, no canon, no ecclesiastical organization. He first conceived a literature of the new covenant, formed by linking Paul's letters to the Gospel. He was the first to supplant syncretism by a Biblical theology, and cosmology by soteriology; he first organized a Catholic Church. The Great Church, confronted by him, took over all his system except the foundation thoughts. The difference between the pre-Marcionite and post-Marcionite Church is greater than that between the pre-Reformation and post-Reformation Church.

Our author now formulates his thesis: To reject the Old Testament in the second century was an error rightly avoided by the Great Church; to keep it in the sixteenth was an unavoidable accident; to keep it as canonical now is the consequence of religious and ecclesiastical paralysis. Luther by reviving the Pauline-Marcionite thesis of the irreconcilability of Law and Gospel laid down the premises but did not draw the conclusions. Before the evangelical Churches lies the task of choosing the edifying parts of the Old Testament for practical use and removing the Old Testament as a whole from its canonical position. At present they are paralyzed by tradition, but in no other way can they win the people, whose objections to religion have nothing to do with Christ, being in the main concerned with the Old Testament.

The review has run to inordinate length, but the matter is important enough to deserve careful study. How tempting the suggestion is! Simplify your religion by cutting out the Old Testament and recognizing that Christ is all you want—then you will win all men of good will. But at what a cost! Who is this Christ? An utterly unhistorical figure, invented by good and clever men of the twentieth century. The Christ of history was a Man of the Old Testament. His first followers saw in Him One Who fulfilled the age-long expectation of the chosen people; the Catholic Church fully realized the difficulties inherent in the Old Testament, but guided, we cannot but

believe, by the Divine Spirit, accepted it as filling an indispensable but subordinate place in its system. To tell a distinguished historian he is doing violence to the facts of history seems an impertinence, but it must be said. Nor can he be acquitted of exaggeration in his account of the second century. That the heresies caused the Church to make explicit what before was only implicit, whether in the realm of doctrine, organization, or the Canon, is a commonplace. But to say that there was no idea of a united and organized Catholic Church before Marcion is absurd. No one now puts the Acts later than 90-100 A.D. Every essential of the Catholic Church is found in them, and the book shows the ideals cherished then, if it does nothing else. And what about St. Ignatius ? The very Paul of whom so much is made is reached by concentrating upon certain passionate and controversial letters of his, ignoring the Pastorals and Acts, and neglecting the Ephesians. Where is this harassed and perplexed Christendom of the second century before Marcion ? In von Harnack's book—yes. But certainly not in the original documents as we read them.

This it seems is the gist of the matter: The Church was Catholic and syncretistic from the very first. Protestantism, after a false turning, is coming back to a simple faith in Jesus as the unique and novel revelation of God's love. But did this Jesus of German Protestantism, this isolated figure detached from Judaism, ever exist ?* We know nothing of Jesus except what we learn from His first followers, and what they thought of Him English Churchmen are content to think. If this be the dividing-line between Catholics and Protestants, then we are all Catholics.

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

NOTICES

The Study of the New Testament: 1883 and 1920. By C. H. Turner, M.A. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Pp. 66. 5s. net.

This monograph contains the Inaugural Lecture delivered by the Ireland Professor of Exegesis before the University of Oxford last year. He deals, necessarily in brief, with the work of New Testament exegesis which has been accomplished during the tenure of the Chair of Exegesis by William Sanday and Walter Lock. Circumstances have decreed that Professor Turner's lecture should be devoted chiefly to the work of Dr. Sanday. He deals in turn with recent research into the problems which surround the formation of the canon of Holy Scripture; with the New Testament writings themselves, the synoptic problem, the text and the

* Is not the anti-Semitism of modern Germany partly responsible for views such as appear in this book ?

language; and with the patristic exegesis of the New Testament. It is a lecture which all students of the Bible would do well to read; not least should it find its way into the hands of the parish clergy. It is a clear and simple outline of the present position reached by scholars who are at work upon the New Testament documents. It is written without any technicalities, and is short, concise, and scholarly. Moreover, it opens up possibilities for further study and research which will be welcome to many.

THE MORAL THEOLOGY OF THE SACRAMENT OF PENANCE. By Watkyn W. Williams, M.A., Rector of Drayton St. Leonard. A. R. Mowbray and Co., Ltd., London. 1 vol. Pp. 230. 7s. 6d.

This book is intended as a handbook on its subject for the clergy. It was first published in 1917, and as the issue now before us is stated to be a new edition, it must be understood that it has proved acceptable. The title, *The Moral Theology of the Sacrament of Penance*, is a little puzzling, as it is not obvious how that moral theology differs from any other. But in truth the term *moral theology* has been used with some considerable variety of meaning. The present writer takes down three books from his shelves. The *Theologia Moralis* of St. Alphonsus Liguori, in three large volumes, after treatises on Conscience, on Laws, and on the Theological Virtues, gives an extended code of Christian teaching on all human duties and all human faults, followed by a treatise on the Sacraments, by the *Praxis Confessarii*, and some other sections. The *Theologia Moralis* of Martinet, in four volumes, is mainly a code based on the Ten Commandments. The *Moraltheologie* of Simar, Professor at Bonn, in one volume of 442 large pages, makes no attempt at a code on the scale of the writers just mentioned, but is an admirable treatise under such headings as free-will, the conscience, the theological virtues, the duty to God, the Sacraments, the duty to our neighbour. Mr. Williams, in his *Moral Theology of the Sacrament of Penance*, has produced a short book of eight chapters (230 pp. of 240 words to a page) which does not undertake to provide a code of casuistry, but gives results of the teaching of moralists on the penitents and on the ministers of penance, on sin, on conscience, and on contracts. It is frankly derived throughout from Lehmkuhl and Gury, from St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Alphonsus Liguori. What is said in the preface, that "there are practically no English text-books," is entirely true. The clergy of the Oxford Movement, when they heard the confessions of their penitents, were on ground which, save for a few instances, had long been left unused. And they made themselves acquainted, as others after them, with Latin or French or German writers, because there were no others, and would gladly acknowledge that they found in them much help. Such a priest, summarizing in a notebook what such writers taught, might well produce a *précis* such as Mr. Williams here gives. But is there not some ground for doubt as to how far such a book has value as itself a manual for the student? It is no doubt important that the younger clergy should bear in mind most of the distinctions indicated in the book. Yet when all is said, the book will not escape what is felt to be the defect of the theological handbook. Also, there is occasion to complain that there is matter here which were better not here. What is the use of giving five pages to Reserved Cases, when with us there is no system of reservation? Another five treat of censures. How many

of our penitents lie under ecclesiastical censure ? There is no better form of absolution for us to use than the form in the *Visitation of the Sick*. But why say that an indicative sentence is necessary (p. 19), when for 1,200 years absolution was commonly conveyed by forms of prayer ? Or, again, see the teaching of perfect and imperfect contrition on p. 28. Dr. Pusey spoke of the imperfection of the contrition of the best of us; and in the Tractarian devotional manuals it was usual to warn against such *attrition* as found sorrow, not for sin, but only for its impending punishment, and to speak of such attrition as not repentance at all, but only remorse.

But let us turn from points of adverse criticism, and seek to find a larger perspective. Mr. Williams has given us a textbook on the work of a priest in penance, a subject on which there is in the English Church a great lack of textbooks. It is well written, clearly arranged, and gives much material in small space. It treats of many points of not very easy distinction on which a young priest may be glad to learn, or a busy priest to refresh his memory. It may serve to lead some to larger study of a neglected subject.

OSCAR D. WATKINS.

THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH, AN ANGLICAN ESSAY. By Hakluyt Egerton. The Faith Press, 1921. 3s. 6d.

Everything which comes from the pen of Hakluyt Egerton is suggestive, and this essay is no exception. On one point, however, it appears to me to be at best misleading. The author claims that the Anglican Liturgy provides for a popular offering of the one Sacrifice, not for a sacerdotal offering, and that Anglican ordination does not confer authority to offer the One Sacrifice. Protestant controversialists will, nevertheless, get little benefit; for this is combined with very strong insistence on the real presence, and turns simply on a particular and, so far as I can see, an inadequate use of language. Hakluyt Egerton's argument holds if the sacrifice is identified with a verbal oblation or with some sacerdotal act of oblation other than and after consecration. It does not deal with those various conceptions of the sacrifice which find the *esse* of the sacrifice in consecration or in consecration and communion.

There is no field in which Anglo-Catholic theology is so weak as in its treatment of the Eucharistic Sacrifice; and against an insistence on the "pleading of the sacrifice," which has primarily in view some specific oblation after consecration, Hakluyt Egerton's criticisms are a valuable and a necessary protest. I would venture to urge, however, that he should explore other conceptions of the sacrifice and that he should restate his view in light of these. I know no one who is so well qualified to face a question in which almost the chief problem is presented by difficulty of definition, and by the need of charity in this respect.

In the rest of the essay there is much which challenges question, and which is put in an unusual way or from an unusual angle. There is very little indeed which has not real value.

WILL SPENS.

THE FULFILMENT OF THE CHURCH. By the Rev. D. Jenks, S.S.M. Pp. xvi+183. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 7s. 6d. net.

One of the most arresting of the religious "signs of the times" is the breaking away on the part of large masses of the population from the various forms of institutional religion. This is the problem with which Fr. Jenks deals in this book. We have learnt to expect from him a method of treating theological questions which is a mixture of sound learning, spiritual insight, and practical common sense. The same gifts are displayed in the present volume. Part I., which is concerned with an attempt to discover the true nature of the Church, gives ample scope for theological scholarship. Part II. deals with the Church's task in modern Western society, and gives an opportunity for the display of the author's administrative and organizing capacity. In both parts, the reader will recognize the work of a man who possesses deep spiritual gifts. Fr. Jenks has chosen to set his chapters into a framework derived from the Epistle to the Ephesians. He conceives of the Church as existing "in the heavenlies" not as a corporation so much as an eternal life, of which a part is manifested in the conditions of phenomenal existence. In the second part he deals with the various practical problems connected with the life and activity of the Church Militant. Thus he passes under review the work of missions, public worship, preaching and scholarship, the ministry of men and women, and by referring each to the ideal of the Church outlined in the earlier chapters is able to give to each practical problem its true perspective. There is no subject of greater moment to-day, within the Church and outside, than the attempt to understand the true nature of the Church. Fr. Jenks has made a notable contribution to this end.

LETTERS OF RICHARD MEUX BENSON. Second Series. Mowbray.

The opinion expressed in the memoir of Father Benson, that he was one of the most powerful of the religious influences in the last century, is corroborated by a careful perusal of this volume. Readers of his devotional commentaries, his paraphrase of the Psalter and of the Lord's Prayer, have always felt that however sublime these writings are, their very detachment from the world makes them difficult while it gives them their power. But the letters penetrate into the heart of the deepest problem of the present day: the failure of the Church to teach the Gospel to the white peoples. They express the solemn conviction that the white races have definitely rejected Christianity; and so afford a corrective of all that is most delusive and most attractive in modern Christian teaching. While we are all captivated by the brilliant results of scientific research, Benson is always deductive: steadfast in his presentation of the divine revelation from the heavenly side. On every page and in every paragraph his teaching stings, uplifts, and convinces of error, while inspiring new hope: for it shows the fundamental distinction between receiving truth in the power of the Holy Spirit, and dissecting it in the pride of man's intellect. Moreover, in days when Christian thought is under the influence of a violent reaction from Calvinism and has largely wandered from all realization of the severity of Christ, it is most salutory for us to be recalled to the Biblical view of our responsibility; the fact of

judgment: the destiny of impenitent sinners and all that forbids vagueness and truckling to human self-complacency. Yet the prophet is filled with the consciousness of being a participator in a transcendental triumph of the Ascended Christ, and he never loses hold of the infinite wonder of the divine life imparted through the Church. While in our anthropocentric delusions we imagine we bring strength to the Church by our energies, Benson uniformly teaches that our energies are given to us by our membership in the Church. Yet, what could be more suggestive than the dictum in one of these letters—that the decay of Christendom has been due to our placing the Eucharist in a position above Baptism: rating the Food more highly than the Life which it sustains? There is certainly no writer among us to-day whose work can stand comparison with these letters in depth of insight, confidence of hope, and uniform loftiness of vision. Yet all that he writes is based on the familiar dogmas, and would make a reader suspect him of moving habitually beyond the range of ordinary minds. But by degrees, we see that every doctrine, every corrective of error with which these pages abound, is grounded on the Saviour's opening message Μετανοεῖτε· ἤγγικεν γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. (Matt. iv. 17), and that it is our concern to drink them in as living truths before it be too late.

E. Lyttleton.

THE PURPOSE OF OUR ANCIENT CHURCHES

Relics or Realities? By B. C. Boulter. S.P.C.K. 1920. Pp. 86. 4s. 6d.

A striking little booklet has lately appeared entitled *Relics or Realities?* The greater part of the papers of which it is composed have already been published in *The Challenge*, and they consist, as the sub-title informs us, of "a simple pilgrim's thoughts on the ancient churches of England." The thoughts, as now presented to us, are illustrated by a large number of archæological sketches, which add considerably to the attractiveness of the publication. Our pilgrim modestly disclaims any expert knowledge of architecture or ecclesiology, although his friends must allow that he writes most agreeably of the same; he is simply a lover of the ancient churches themselves; what they stand for in the light of the historic past; what they should stand for in the life of the English people to-day. And so he sets out on his pilgrimage—and we may be permitted to accompany him—with these thoughts in his mind: Are these ancient buildings regarded simply from an antiquarian standpoint as interesting relics of the past; or are they also regarded, as undoubtedly they should be, as living realities of to-day? In other words, to put the question shortly, are they relics or realities?

As we journey along the pilgrim's way, our leader has much pleasant discourse about many things past and present. Above all, he would inspire us with the same lofty ideal which inspired the church builders of long ago. He acknowledges to the full the antiquarian lore and interest which is associated with even the humblest of our parish churches; at the same time he would have us realize their high and sacred purpose. He is filled with enthusiasm at the thought of a service recently held on a Bank Holiday in the ruins of Tintern Abbey at which large numbers of tourists attended. He is delighted at the devout "restoration" of Kirkstead

Church in Lincolnshire as an illustration not only of repairing a ruin, but also of restoring a church to its sacred use. This leads him to impress upon his fellow-pilgrims the dictum that safety, usefulness, and edification constitute the only valid grounds for interfering with old churches. How some of us wished that our master-pilgrim had lived in the days of the early Tractarian Movement, when irreparable damage was done in the way of "restoration" to so many of our ancient churches. "Further," said our guide, philosopher, and friend, "no work except of the best should ever be placed in an old church. No stained-glass saints ordered by the yard from London, no pavements of mechanically-glazed tiles, no Gothic reredoses ornamented with coloured marbles, no cheap lacquered brasswork—these things," he said, "smell of the shop, and have no life in them." They do not express either the joy of craftsmanship or the joy of faith; they are just articles of merchandise.

We pass on our pilgrimage through pleasant places. We study Saxon architecture at St. Martin's, Canterbury, and at East Barton and Barnack in Northamptonshire. The Norman style, early and late, is brought before us in the spacious crypt of Canterbury Cathedral, with its capitals of rude and fantastic ornamentation; in the Priory Church of St. Bartholomew the Great in Smithfield; in the wonderful vault or crypt of the Priory of St. John of Jerusalem in Clerkenwell. The exquisite "Early English" style, than which, it has been said, "no architecture in the world better expresses happiness," is seen in the magnificent west front of Wells Cathedral, and at Whitby Abbey in Yorkshire. We visit Ely Chapel off Holborn, and the Austin Friars' Church off Old Broad Street, to study the "decorated" period; and later on the stately church of Dorchester-on-the-Thames and the Rood Tower of Lincoln Cathedral. For the "perpendicular" style, which prevailed in England for roughly two centuries, and of which we have examples in almost every ancient church, we tarry again at Canterbury, from whence we started, and see in the wonderful central tower of the cathedral one of the most perfect structures that Gothic architecture has produced.

Our pilgrimage has been a happy and instructive one. We have learnt much from our pilgrim-guide. Sometimes, perhaps, we could have wished for a more exact use of language or a clearer insight into the significance of historical events; but the glorious architecture has naturally appealed to us, and we have been no less impressed with our friend's enthusiasm for the sacredness and solemnity of the buildings themselves. They are relics, or realities, or both, according to the spirit in which they are regarded. That they are *relics*, and priceless ones, cannot be gainsaid; whether they be *realities* must depend upon ourselves.

J. VAUGHAN.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER